STUDIA ANSELMIANA

PHILOSOPHICA THEOLOGICA

EDITA A PROFESSORIBUS INSTITUTI PONTIFICII S. ANSELMI DE URBE

FASCICULUS XXX

PONTIFICIUM INSTITUTUM S. ANSELMI - ROMAE - 1952

UNIVERSITY OF PRINCETON
NOV 1954
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

AN ANNOTATED DATE-LIST

OF THE WORKS OF MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR

BY

POLYCARP SHERWOOD O.S.B.

PROFESSOR OF PATROLOGY AT THE PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE
S. ANSELMO, ROME

« ORBIS CATHOLICUS » - HERDER - ROMAE 1952

NIHIL OBSTAT

Romae, die 20 Februarii 1952

✠ BERNARDUS KAELIN
Abbas Primas O. S. B.

IMPRIMATUR

Romae, die 18 Martii 1952

✠ ALOYSIUS TRAGLIA
Archiep. Caesarien., Vicesgerens

SCUOLA SALESIANA DEL LIBRO - ROMA - PIAZZA S. MARIA AUSILIATRICE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	Pag.	VII
Abbreviations	»	VIII
PART I. Narrative of Maximus' Life and Work	»	1
PART II. Annotated Date-list of Maximus' Works . . .	»	23
Indices	»	57

FOREWORD

The present annotated date-list of Maximus' works is the by-product of other work on Maximus — of a reconstruction of his life, based on the scattered notices of the epistles and opuscula, and of an attempt to present his doctrine synthetically. Such a study once well begun, it became evident that no one had drawn full profit from the sources as they have been available since Combefis' edition. Devreesse has disentangled the sources of the *Vita,* but he has made no detailed reconstruction except where the various pieces of the *Acta* give information, that is for the trial and death of the Confessor.

Therefore, continuing on the basis of Grumel's and Devreesse's work on the historical side and of von Balthasar's essay of dating on the literary and theological side, I attempted to date the letters and opuscula and to draw into the open their diverse relations. First I drew up a documented narrative of Maximus' life; but I soon perceived that not a little of the material amassed was either not used or so disposed in the narrative and the notes that it could with difficulty be brought to bear all at once on any one of the several items. It seemed to me useful then to draw up the present annotated date-list, which with its appended indices makes all the information readily available.

Yet there remained a difficulty: to one not thoroughly acquainted with the material some consecutive account seems necessary to a ready understanding of the detail. Thus despite the repetition inevitably involved, I here present both the synthetic and analytic studies. It is due to the kindness of the Reverend Doctors Johannes Quasten and Joseph C. Plumpe, editors of the *Ancient Christian Writers* series, that I am able to reproduce here the narrative of Maximus' life and the development of his opposition to Monothelitism that forms part of the introduction to the *Ascetical Life* and the *Centuries on Charity* to appear in that series.

FOREWORD

The present annotated date-list of Maximus' works is the by-product of other work on Maximus — of a reconstruction of his life, based on the scattered notices of the epistles and opuscula, and of an attempt to present his doctrine synthetically. Such a study once well begun, it became evident that no one had drawn full profit from the sources as they have been available since Combefis' edition. Devreesse has disentangled the sources of the *Vita,* but he has made no detailed reconstruction except where the various pieces of the *Acta* give information, that is for the trial and death of the Confessor.

Therefore, continuing on the basis of Grumel's and Devreesse's work on the historical side and of von Balthasar's essay of dating on the literary and theological side, I attempted to date the letters and opuscula and to draw into the open their diverse relations. First I drew up a documented narrative of Maximus' life; but I soon perceived that not a little of the material amassed was either not used or so disposed in the narrative and the notes that it could with difficulty be brought to bear all at once on any one of the several items. It seemed to me useful then to draw up the present annotated date-list, which with its appended indices makes all the information readily available.

Yet there remained a difficulty: to one not thoroughly acquainted with the material some consecutive account seems necessary to a ready understanding of the detail. Thus despite the repetition inevitably involved, I here present both the synthetic and analytic studies. It is due to the kindness of the Reverend Doctors Johannes Quasten and Joseph C. Plumpe, editors of the *Ancient Christian Writers* series, that I am able to reproduce here the narrative of Maximus' life and the development of his opposition to Monothelitism that forms part of the introduction to the *Ascetical Life* and the *Centuries on Charity* to appear in that series.

ABBREVIATIONS

A. for the works of Maximus:

Amb	*Ambiguorum liber*
Cap ie'	*Capita* 15
Char	*Centuries on Charity*
Comp. Eccl. . .	*Computus Ecclesiasticus*
DB	Dispute at Bizya
ep	epistle
LA	*Liber Asceticus*
Myst	*Mystagogia*
PN	*Exposition of the* OUR FATHER
Ps 59	*Exposition of psalm* 59
QD	*Quaestiones et Dubia*
RM	*Relatio Motionis*
Thal	*Quaestiones ad Thalassium*
Theop	*Quaestiones ad Theopemptum*
ThOec	*Capita Theologica et Oeconomica*
TP	*Opuscula Theologica et Polemica*

B. other abbreviations:

a.	anno
AB	*Analecta Bollandiana*
c.	circiter
CP (ΚΠ) . . .	Constantinople
DTC	*Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*
EH	KIRCH, *Enchiridion fontium historiae ecclesiae antiquae*
EO	*Echos d'Orient*
KL	VON BALTHASAR, *Kosmische Liturgie*
RevScrel . . .	*Revue des Sciences religieuses*
PG	MIGNE, *Patrologia Graeca*
PL	MIGNE, *Patrologia Latina*

Fuller bibliographical information is found in note 1.

PART I

NARRATIVE OF MAXIMUS' LIFE AND WORK

Born[1] in 580, Maximus received his formation and schooling during the years of Gregory the Great's pontificate. The education thus received was doubtless that common to all the youths who looked forward to the imperial service, to the church, or simply to affairs. It comprised the usual grammar, rhetoric, and philosophy. Under philosophy was included the quadrivium (arithmetic, music, geometry, astronomy) and philosophy itself. This philosophical instruction was

---

[1] The following list gives the more recent studies dealing with the life and literary heritage of Maximus. For earlier literature and for doctrinal studies I refer the reader to GRUMEL's article in the DTC or to the bibliography prefixed to LOOSEN's study: *Logos und Pneuma im begnadeten Menschen bei Maximus Confessor*, Münster 1941. BALTHASAR, H. U. VON, *Die Gnostischen Centurien des Maximus Confessor (Die Gn. Cent* or simply: VON BALTHASAR, followed by page number) Freiburg i. Br. 1941; the same, *Kosmische Liturgie Maximus der Bekenner: Höhe und Krisis des griechischen Welt ilds* Fre burg i. Br. 1941 (KL followed by the page number of the German edition, of the French, Paris, 1947); DE VREESSE, Robert, *La vie de S. Maxime le Confesseur et ses recensions, Anal. Bolland.* (AB) 46 (1928) 5-49; the same, *Le texte grec de l'Hypomnesticon de Théodore Spoudée,* AB 53 (1935) 49-80; the same, *La fin inédite d'une lettre de s. Maxime, Rev. des Sciences religieuses* (RevScrel) 17 (1937) 25-35, EPIFANOVITCH, S.L., *Materials to serve in the study of the life and works of St. Maximus the Confessor* (Epifanovitch) Kiev 1917 (in Russian; see the table of contents in *Rev. d'hist. éccl.* 24 [1928] 802f.); GRUMEL, V., *Notes d'histoire et de chronologie sur la vie de s. Maxime le Conf., Echos d'Orient* (EO) 26 (1927) 24-32; the same, *Recherches sur l'histoire du monthélisme;* EO 27 (1928) 6 and after; the same, *Maxime de Chrysopolis,* DTC 10, 448-59; (PEETERS, P.) "Maximi" in the *Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Decembris* (1940) p. 336f. PIERRES, Johannes, *S. Maximus Confessor - princeps apologetarum synodi Lateranensis a. 649* (*Pars historica*) Rome 1940 (diss.; see ALTANER in *Theol. Revue* 41 [1942] 50). Conciliar texts I cite from MANSI's *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* under the name Mansi; where possible I add the reference to KIRCH's *Enchiridion fontium historiae ecclesiae antiquae* (EH).

based chiefly on the works of Plato and Aristotle, along with the commentators.[2]

It would have been therefore in the impressionable years of youth that Maximus made his first acquaintance alike with Aristotle and the Neoplatonists. For it was the commentaries of Proclus, Jamblichus and the like that accompanied the texts of the masters. It is worthwhile noting this first contact with the Neoplatonic thought; for it would seem that the love of the supernal world there first imparted flowered not only in his monastic vocation but in the whole of his theological activity as defender and interpreter of Denis the Mystic and of Gregory the Theologian.

Before however he was to start out on the monastic life, Maximus was to attain one of the highest positions at the imperial court — namely that of first secretary to Heraclius, who came to power in 610. It was doubtless during the years of his schooling and imperial service that he formed those close friendships with men of the court that his later correspondence permits us to appreciate.

His time of service with the emperor was not long. Probably about the year 613-14 Maximus withdrew to a monastery, that of Chrysopolis (now Scútari) on the Asiatic shore across from Constantinople. His biographer is probably right in saying that his love for the life of solitude (the hesychast life) prompted him to leave the court.

In this life too he made quick progress. By the year 618 he already had a disciple, the monk Anastasius, who was to be with him to the end.

Theological position at the outset.

Only some 6 or 7 years after Anastasius had become his disciple (in 624-25), Maximus must have left his first monastery at Chrysopolis for that of St George at Cyzicus (now Erdek).[3] His earlier writings, with but one possible exception (ep 6), are to be assigned to this stay. It was from here that he wrote the first surviving letters

---

[2] On this general education (*egkuklios paideusis*) see KOUKOULÈS, Phédon, *Vie et civilisation Byzantines* (Athens 1948) t. I, 1 pp. 105-37; on the schools at Constantinople see DVORNIK, F. *Photius et la réorganisation de l'Académie patriarcale,* AB 68 (1950) 108-19, especially 110f. In both the imperial and patriarchal schools the general education was given, in the former however no theology.

[3] See items 16, 19 and my article in the *Am. Benedictine Review* 1 (1950) 347 - 56.

to John the Chamberlain, among which that magnificent encomium on charity, of which Combefis says: *vere maximum agit Maximus.* Surely this little treatise is worthy of the highest praise, yet it betrays a point of view in the spiritual life and a terminology which could only be favorable to the Monenergistic and Monothelite heresies. Thus in eulogy of our union with God he writes:

> As we all have one nature, so we are able to have with God and with one another but one mind (gnome) and one will, being in no way at odds either with God or with one another.[4]

This illustrates, as well as any one passage can, how apt for confusion such terminology was, and indicates equally well a spirituality which places the summit of holiness in the unity of wills. I have been brought to think that this spirituality was in large measure common property not only among the Byzantines but also among the Monophysites. This being true it will not be difficult to understand the caution with which Maximus proceeded in taking up a clear-cut opposition to Sergius and Pyrrhus in their feelers for compromise with the Monophysites.

In any case it was also at Cyzicus and in discussion with Bishop John that the *Ambigua* were conceived in which he makes a similar statement about one will of God and the saints, which afterwards he felt bound to retract.[5]

Though then this larger group of *Ambigua* were written down only after Maximus had arrived in Africa, yet they were thought out in Cyzicus in his talks with the bishop.[6] It is clear even from a cursory reading that it is not the Monophysites or Monenergists which gave them anxiety but the Origenists. These *Ambigua* are a refutation of Origenism, especially of the doctrine of the henad, with a full understanding and will to retain what is good in the Alexandrian's doctrine — a refutation perhaps unique in Greek patristic literature.[7]

A careful and full analysis of this whole block of questions is necessary for establishing or disproving the homogeneity of Maximus' thought. Given a self-consistent thought-structure in these *Ambigua*

---

[4] ep 2 - 396C.
[5] Amb 7-1076C. TP 1 - 33A.
[6] Amb Introd. - 1064B.
[7] Amb 7 and KL 97/81.

one would be justified in understanding the Gnostic Centuries,[8] so predominantly Origenistic, in the light of this structure. In fact this Origenistic influence is so strong[9] that von Balthasar speaks of a real Origenistic crisis in the Confessor's thought and conjectures his supposed stay at Alexandria in 633 as the occasion of this crisis.[10]

Now the texture of Maximus' refutation of Origen in the *Ambigua* seems to me sufficiently coherent. We may then point out some of the relations that obtain between the 2 centuries in question and the other works of Maximus.

First of all the 2 centuries seem to be a literary unity, not the work of a compiler.[11] Von Balthasar has drawn attention to the many similarities between the centuries and the *Questions to Thalassius* and to *Theopemptus*. I for my part would draw particular attention to the intimate relations which bind the contrary motifs of the centuries with the *Ambigua*. Of the contrary motifs by far the most noteworthy are the initial group of ten.[12] This ten is obviously a unit[13] and as clearly a forceful summary of the antiorigenist doctrine of the *Ambigua*.

Its position at the beginning of the 200 predominantly Origenist chapters is highly significant. Maximus, basing himself on the *Ambigua*, is giving, as it were, the metaphysical framework in which the Origenist and Evagrian sentences are to be understood. They are to be understood in the context he gives, not that of their original authors.[14]

If such an interpretation of Maximus be tenable, he then appears not as suffering an Origenist crisis, but as deliberately endeavoring

---

[8] See item 37.

[9] In VON BALTHASAR's analysis of these centuries 94 are given as of Origenistic motif, 36 Evagrian, a total of 130 against 70 assigned to opposed motifs, drawn from Denis the Mystic and others.

[10] KL 42/40.

[11] *Die Gn. Cent.* p. 23.

[12] See item 37.

[13] I hope at a later date to give detailed substantiation of what I am here asserting.

[14] St. Thomas Aquinas has done something similar for Aristotle's doctrine of substance. The doctrine and its terminology has been retained and transposed intact to a context in which the distinction of essence and existence is primordial. See GILSON, *Being and Some Philosophers* (Toronto 1949) 166, also 160-62.

to give the assimilable elements in the Alexandrian master's thought a secure place in monastic tradition. The success of this effort is another and quite distinct question.

The *Ambigua* then, though composed later in Africa, were conceived and thought out in discussions with the bishop of Cyzicus. Judging from the extent of the *Ambigua* and the relations of abbot and spiritual son obtaining between the bishop and Maximus, his stay at Cyzicus must have actually been of some duration. I should say at least a year, with the expectation that it was to have been permanent.[15] The advance of the Persians on Constantinople in the spring of 626, as Msgr. Devreesse has pointed out,[16] will have occasioned the dispersal of the monastery of St George at Cyzicus and sent Maximus further on his way to Africa.

Progress to and establishment in Africa.

On this journey there are two possible stopovers — Cyprus and Crete. Maximus himself tells us that once he had been in Crete, that the Severian bishops then held a dispute with him.[17] This notice tells us two things: the stay in Crete was more than a passing call; Maximus was already known as a theologian and defender of the Chalcedonian faith. Doubtless it was during this stay that he made the acquaintance of the bishop of Cydonia, the third principal town in Crete,[18] to whom later he writes at his correspondent's request.

For a stop in Cyprus we have no similar direct statement of Maximus, but may only infer it from the fact of his correspondence with the Cypriote Marinus[19] and from a possible acquaintance with the bishop Arcadius.[20]

When did Maximus finally arrive in proconsular Africa? The end

---

[15] See items 16 and 19.

[16] RevScrel 17 (1937) 31ff. DEVREESSE speaks of Maximus' departure from Chrysopolis. The same event however is sufficient to explain the dispersion of St. George's monastery at Cyzicus.

[17] TP 3 - 49C. Maximus does not indicate the time of this stay; but as there is nowhere a hint that once in Africa he was ever again in the eastern Mediterranean before his arrest, it is more reasonable to assign this stay to the year 626-27.

[18] ep 21 - 604; see item 21.

[19] See item 33.

[20] See below note 55.

of epistle 8, as published by Devreesse,[21] makes it clear that he was at Carthage at least by Pentecost of 632. I think, however, his actual arrival should be set back a few years before that date. How long before depends on Maximus' relations with Sophronius. Now it is known that Sophronius, at Alexandria in June of 633, was elected patriarch of Jerusalem in 634. Hence the relations which bound the two men together would have to have been formed before 633. Sophronius and Maximus dwelt in the same African monastery while Sergius the patriarch and his fellows (among whom was Pyrrhus) were fabricating Monenergism.[22] This monastery was called *Eucratas,*[23] Sophronius' surname.[24] Of this community Sophronius was apparently the head, for Maximus refers to him as teacher and *abbas.*[25] All seem agreed that Sophronius was largely responsible for awakening Maximus to a sense of danger in the new heresy. What the extent of that influence was, is still to be determined.[26] In any case the relations of master and spiritual guide which Maximus gives to Sophronius in his own regard demand some length of time for their formation. Tentatively then let us assign Maximus' arrival in Africa to the years 628-30.

The group of letters to the bishop of Cyzicus, 28-31, 8, all express Maximus' desire to be restored to the bishop's community of St George's, Cyzicus. Perhaps the group of 4 were written in the first years of his exile and epistle 8 when the master he had found in Sophronius was already on his way to the east. In any case at the end of epistle 8 he still prays to be brought back[27] though doubtless with the same readiness to bear the separation, with the help of their prayers, as he expresses in letter 31.[28]

However about this time, 632-33, I suppose that Maximus came

---

[21] See note 16.

[22] TP 12 - 142A4ff.

[23] ep 12 - 461A8ff. John Moschus was also surnamed *Eucratas* (DELEHAYE, AB 45 [1927] 6). The Sophronius of Maximus is certainly the patriarch; this surname connects him with Moschus. DELEHAYE (*loc. cit.)* apparently does not consider this in declaring the identity of the Sophronius of Moschus and the patriarch as still uncertain.

[24] The ms inscriptions to ep 8; see item 19.

[25] ep 13 - 533A.

[26] See VON BALTHASAR, *Die Gn. Cent.* p. 155f.

[27] ep 8 - 445A.

[28] ep 31 - 625C *ult.*

to accept his exile as a permanent thing. In the extant correspondence there is no further mention of returning to the east. From one letter, the 25th, it also appears that he had in Africa a superior to whom he must excuse himself. This Conon, of whom we know nothing further, succeeded perhaps Sophronius in the direction of the exile Byzantine community near Carthage.

It is during the first years of this African stay that Maximus composed his two great works that have come down to us complete — the *Questions to Thalassius* and the earlier, larger *Ambigua.*

Relations with imperial governors.

In the years that follow there are three elements in Maximus' life: his continuing monastic life, his relations with the imperial governors of Africa, his activity against Monophysitism and the rising heresy, Monenergism and Monothelitism.

Of this first there is little one can say, for it has no external history. Yet it is well to realize that Maximus remained a monk and a contemplative to the very core throughout all the subsequent controversies and polemics. To be convinced of this it is enough to read the remarks with which he prefaces his great polemic work *Ad Marinum.*[25]

Of the governors there are two with whom Maximus was intimately connected: Peter the Illustrious and George.

Peter, *strategos* of Numidia, was ordered in the year 633 to proceed to Egypt.[30] To this same Peter Maximus addresses a little treatise against the doctrine of Severus. Peter has just informed him of the safe conclusion of a sea voyage and of the return to their heresy of some ill-converted Monophysites. Peter must then have been at Alexandria after the Pact of Union of June 633. Finally Maximus refers Peter to Sophronius, who, he says, is able to supply all the deficiencies of the letter.

The next letter we have to Peter is to recommend to him the newly converted Alexandrian deacon Cosmas, that he may in case of necessity use his good offices with the "God-honored pope".[31]

---

[29] TP 1 - 9 - 12; see note 79.

[30] RM 1 - 112AB; for Peter's other movements see ep 13 - 509C, 512 BC, 533A.

[31] ep 14 - 536A4.

The reference is doubtless to Cyrus of Alexandria, and Peter is still or again in that town.

Finally we find Peter again in Africa where he had occasion to be concerned over the title accorded there to the expatriarch Pyrrhus, *most holy*. Maximus' reply is an impassioned review of the whole Monothelite question.[32]

Maximus' relations with George were perhaps closer; at least we know more about them because of the disaster in which his term as eparch ended. Only one letter is addressed to George, a letter of encouragement in time of trial.[33] This whole affair Maximus reports to his friend at court, John the Chamberlain.[34] The story briefly is this. George had endeared himself to the whole population by his care of widows and orphans, by his solicitude for the persons displaced by the Mohammedan conquests, by his zeal for the Chalcedonian orthodoxy. Not least was he solicitous for his fellow Byzantines and for the exile monks of the Eucratas monastery. In November 641 a certain Theodore arrived at Carthage, bearing letters supposedly from the empress-regent Martina, ordering George to set at liberty some Monophysite nuns. When this was noised among the people there was a great commotion and the empress' good name for orthodoxy was gravely compromised. Therefore to preserve her reputation and to quiet the people, George, having consulted Maximus, declared the letters spurious. Shortly after this incident George was recalled to Constantinople.

This recall can scarcely be a result of the Theodore incident; there is not the time for a courier to have gone to Constantinople and to have returned. If such were the case, Martina's fall from power, autumn 641, would certainly have been known in Africa and reflected itself in the correspondence seeking George's return; but there is no such reflection. It seems therefore much more probable that George and Maximus were right in declaring the Martina letters spurious.

However that may be, the Africans, especially the Byzantines,

---

[32] TP 12 - 141-46. It may be that Peter was sent again to Africa after the recall of George.

[33] ep 1 - 364ff.

[34] ep 12. The sequence of events is not too clear. Aside from ep 12, ep 18, 1, 44, C (EPIFANOVITCH p. 84f.), 45 pertain to this affair. See items 66, 67, 69-72.

were left in great uncertainty as to the outcome of this recall for their beloved eparch.

In all his relations with public officials Maximus appears as their counsellor and above all as solicitous for their orthodoxy in regard, almost exclusively, to Monophysitism.

Monothelite Controversy: the "Psephos".

This constant polemic against Monophysitism as such without suggestion of the developing heresies, Monenergism and Monothelitism, brings us face to face with the problem of the rise of Maximus' opposition to these heresies. Father Grumel gives the impression that Maximus was very slow in entering the lists against Monothelitism. The letter to Peter about Pyrrhus' title *most holy* (written 643 44) he terms the first openly antimonothelitic document from the Confessor's hands.[35]

This is rather late, ten years after the Pact of Union of Alexandria; and all the more surprising when Maximus himself in the dispute with Pyrrhus[36] assigns the first steps of Monenergism to the letter of Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, to George Arsas asking for patristic texts in favor of one energy. This was in the year 617.[37]

It cannot here be a question even of sketching the rise of these heresies; the outlining however of the genesis of Maximus' attitude towards them can scarce be omitted. The remarks then that follow must suppose some knowledge of the former.[38]

Without doubt the anonymous biographer throws the hardened position of controversy back many years before its time when he relates that the rising heresy was a chief motive for Maximus in leaving the imperial service.[39] This certainly was not the case. The first clear indication of his diffidence or rather nonacceptance of Monenergism is found in the later *Ambigua*, showing the influence of Sophronius' synodicon of 634[40] and in his reply to Pyrrhus (ep 19)

---

[35] So GRUMEL, EO 26 (1927) 30.

[36] TP 28 - 332Bff.

[37] DUCHESNE, *L'Église au vie siècle* (Paris 1925) p. 394, gives this year.

[38] For the history of Monothelitism note also GRUMEL's studies mentioned in note 1.

[39] *Vita et Certamen* 5, PG 90, 72C.

[40] *Die Gn. Cent.* 152; KL 42f./40.

which is subsequent by but a little to Cyrus' Pact of Union and to Sergius' judgement *(psephos)* against the disputed terminology.

This is the first evidence come down to us; it is amply sufficient.

Of these documents the letter to Pyrrhus is of greater importance.[41] Pyrrhus had written Maximus, relating the action of Sergius in regard to the openly Monenergistic Pact of Alexandria and seeking his support for the Sergian policy.

The judgement *(psephos)* of Sergius, to which Maximus refers,[42] has come down to us. Grumel has given as the text of this *psephos* a passage from Sergius' letter to Honorius.[43] He seems, however, to have overlooked a passage a few paragraphs above in the same letter which is textually repeated in the *Ecthesis* of 638.[44] Now it is known that the *Ecthesis* was no more than the *psephos* promulgated over the imperial signature.[45] I believe therefore that we have the very text of the *psephos* in the passage just indicated.

The Pact of Union had patently admitted one operation. The *psephos* forbade mention either of one or two operations of Christ, it being alone permissible to refer to the only-begotten Son Jesus Christ operating what is divine and human, as proceeding from the one Incarnate Word of God. So far so good; in this there is nothing overtly heterodox. But why this restriction? The *psephos* goes on: Some are scandalized because to speak of one operation seems to imply denial of the two natures which our Lord possesses - an objection scarce worthy of attention. On the other hand many are scandalized, because the phrase two operations is not found in the fathers and implies two contrary wills in our Lord.

This latter part of the *psephos* is clearly tendentious; but as these pros and cons are presented not as a matter of precept but only as a matter of accessory opinion, one could let them pass.

What then is Maximus' attitude toward this document? Sophronius in his synodicon had avoided the proscribed terminology, while forcefully combatting the underlying doctrinal tendency. Maximus

---

[41] The more so that Maximus assures us of its complete orthodoxy (TP 9 - 132C9).

[42] ep 19 - 592C5.

[43] EO 27 (1928) 13; the text is taken from MANSI 11, 536E - 537A.

[44] See item 42.

[45] RM 10 - 126AB.

similarly accepts the *psephos*, but according to his own doctrinal interpretation. The reason for his great praise of Sergius is precisely this, Sergius' rejection of the Alexandrian novelty, that is the Monenergistic Pact of Union. This *psephos* maintains the right doctrine in the face of this error.[46] He then proceeds to state what is this right doctrine. When he comes to speak of the Incarnation, he is most explicit. Sergius, in writing to Honorius, and later Pyrrhus, in his dispute with Maximus,[47] assign all suffering and passion to the humanity of Christ alone and then correspondingly all operation to the Godhead. Maximus seems to have such a thought in mind when in this letter he stresses with exceptional vigor the exchange of properties (*communicatio idiomatum*), writing: " He works humanly what is divine... and divinely what is human."[48] It is only a few lines further on that he enunciates the principle governing the whole question :

> That which is made up of diverse things without mixing them, by a natural bond of union, both preserves their component natures unchanged and conserves undiminished their (several) component powers for the completion of a single work.[49]

Here we find not only the distinction of two natures maintained, but likewise that of the consequent powers. Unity is found in the work done not in the doing. The distinction of operations is not here explicitly affirmed (it is necessarily implied); perhaps because there was a real confusion of terminology, which gave specious justification to the tendentiousness of the *psephos* and about which Maximus is careful to seek further explanations.[50]

Maximus then with great dexterity affirms the orthodox doctrine in this question, while still observing the *psephos*, an authoritative document; he avoids offending the official party while making it clear that the favored Monenergism is scarcely acceptable unless the term *operation* is explained.

This is precisely the weak point. It was above all Sergius' tergiversations on the meaning of the will that chiefly turned Maximus

---

[46] ep 19 - 592B-C7.
[47] Sergius to Honorius, MANSI 11, 536B; *Dispute with Pyrrhus,* TP 28 - 349C.
[48] ep 19 - 593A2f.
[49] ep 19 - 593B1-5.
[50] ep 19 - 596B.

against him.[51] This testimony of Maximus on the progress of his opposition to Sergius is trustworthy, for he gave it in the presence of Pyrrhus who was in a position to object to any misstatement or exaggeration. Now the death of Sergius (Dec. 9, 638) followed but a couple of months on the publication of the *Ecthesis*. Maximus therefore must have taken his stand, but not thereby inaugurating an active polemic, against Sergius' doctrine quite apart from the open controversy precipitated by the publication of this document.

This is more than mere surmise. We have still a letter of Maximus written after Honorius' death (Oct. 12, 638) but before news of the *Ecthesis* reached him, that is before the spring of 640.[52] In this tome to Marinus of Cyprus[53] after a consideration of two passages from the fathers, seeming to favor Monenergism or Monothelitism, Maximus treats of Honorius' letter to Sergius. Here he corroborates his own interpretation of Honorius in a perfectly orthodox and dyothelite sense with the reports of the affair that his friend Anastasius had secured for him in Rome.[54]

There can be no doubt whatsoever that a letter such as this was intended for a more numerous audience than its immediate recipient. Nor can there be any doubt, in view of the final reference to Marinus' bishop[55] as a defender of the « one spotless, orthodox faith », that Maximus was quite aware that he was taking sides in a controverted question.

In the east therefore, and consequently also for Maximus, the issue was well joined before the *Ecthesis*. Between Rome and Constantinople however it was the *Ecthesis* that brought the question to a head.

---

[51] See TP 28 - 330C-332B2, where 6 interpretations are attributed to Sergius. Perhaps all of them are not Sergius' own personal interpretations, they would at least be of his entourage.

[52] See note 57.

[53] TP 20 - 245C.

[54] TP 20 - 244Cff.

[55] TP 20 - 245C. Who might this bishop be? Combefis suggests Arcadius. Maximus refers to this Arcadius, in his letter to Peter (TP 12 - 143B), as already dead. This letter was written probably in the latter part of 643; we know Sergius and other bishops of Cyprus wrote pope Theodore a joint-letter May 29, 643 (MANSI 10, 913-16). As this letter does not appear to be a synodical letter on the occasion of Sergius' election, we are left with no sure determination of the date of Arcadius' death or of Sergius' election.

Monothelite Controversy: the "Ecthesis".

The *Ecthesis* was in substance but the *psephos* of 634 republished, but this time over the emperor's signature. *In substance*, for the accompanying matter manifests a clear development in the sense of Monothelitism. The very speaking of two wills is represented as beyond the daring of Nestorius; he spoke of two sons, but also of identity of will. Therefore the document goes on, "let us confess one will of our Lord and true God Jesus Christ" that there be no chance of conflict between the human nature and the divine Word.[56]

This document came to the knowledge of the Roman authorities on the return of Severinus' apocrisaries sent to Constantinople to obtain the imperial approval of his election to the Roman see. These apocrisaries were sufficiently astute to obtain imperial approval for Severinus without committing him to the *Ecthesis*. This took time. It was not till the spring of 640 that they returned to Rome with the *Ecthesis;* for Severinus was consecrated only May 28, 640.[57] That Severinus condemned the *Ecthesis* before his death a few months later (August 2, 640) is not certain.[58]

Maximus received knowledge of the *Ecthesis* about the same time as Severinus. His friends at Constantinople informed him of all the attempted bargaining with the pope's apocrisaries and sent him a copy of the document only after these same ambassadors had left Constantinople. We learn of this only from Maximus' letter to Thalassius. Unfortunately there remains only the first part of the letter; Maximus' comments on the *Ecthesis* did not serve Anastasius' purposes, he did not therefore preserve them for us.[59] Maximus first reaction to the *Ecthesis* then we can only infer from the approving way in which he recounts the apocrisaries' accomplishment of their mission.

The next, surely-dated group of letters that we have are those pertaining to the recall of George, dating from the fall of 641 and

---

[56] MANSI 10, 996BC (KIRCH, EH §§ 1072 f.).

[57] GRUMEL (EO 29 [1930] 24) gives this date. The delay in consecration could only have been due to the detention of the apocrisaries at Constantinople.

[58] See R. AIGRAIN, *in* FLICHE et MARTIN, *Histoire de l'Eglise* 5, 400 n. 6.

[59] We have only the Latin version preserved in the *Collectanea* of Anastasius (PL 129, 583Df.; printed also in MANSI 10, 677f.).

early 642.[60] The 12th letter only need detain us here. Why does this letter enter into detail about the Monophysitism of Severus while giving no indication of the Monothelite controversy? One cannot suppose, as we have just seen, that Maximus was unaware of the controversy or failed to see its importance. The explanations must be sought elsewhere, in the peculiar circumstances which called forth this letter.

The *Ecthesis* had anathematized Severus.[61] But now the whole tenor of the letter brought by Theodore manifested a decided favoring of the Severians. Even supposing Theodore to be an impostor, the suspicion necessarily hangs on that the danger at Constantinople was not from the defenders of the *Ecthesis*, whose then chief, Pyrrhus, Maximus may have already known to have been deposed (September 29, 641), but from Severian Monophysitism. In a word, this was definitely not the occasion for speaking of the *Ecthesis* and its doctrine.

Crisis: the affair of Pyrrhus.

The year following Heraclius' death (February 11, 641) was one of change at Constantinople. At Rome John IV took definite action against the *Ecthesis;*[62] yet it was not he but his successor Theodore who was to bring the matter finally to a head.

There have come down to us three documents[63] of Theodore which inform us of this affair at the outset of his pontificate (con-

---

[60] ep 12 relates this affair to John the Chamberlain, with a refutation of the Monophysite position of Severus; ep 1 to George at his departure, ep 44, 45 again to John, commending George to him; ep B to Stephen at Constantinople to insure the correct transmission of an important document.

[61] MANSI 10, 996D *ult.*

[62] John wrote in defense of Honorius and for the removal of the *Ecthesis* to Heraclius' son Constantine, who died in May 641 (the letter is in MANSI 10, 682-86 and PL 129, 561). BRÉHIER seems to have slipped (FLICHE et MARTIN, *Hist. de l'Eglise* 5, 143 n. 5) in gathering from this letter that Pyrrhus was already no longer patriarch. He was deposed only September 29, 641 (see BROOKS, *Byz. Zeitschr.* 6 [1897] 53f.), several months after Constantine's death.

[63] Letters to Paul of Constantinople in response to his synodical letters, to the consecrators of Paul, and a short statement against the innovations of Pyrrhus and the *Ecthesis*. They are to be found in MANSI 10, 702-08 and PL 129, 577ff. They must date from the end of 642 or the beginning of 643, as Paul had been patriarch of Constantinople from October 1, 641, a full year before Theodore's consecration.

secrated November 24, 642). It was not so much the rejection of the *Ecthesis* that is noteworthy, but its being reckoned as a work of Pyrrhus (Sergius is not mentioned). Further Pyrrhus is considered personally. Theodore is frankly perturbed that this author of Monothelitism has been deposed, not for his heresy but merely on account of the people's dislike for him. Theodore therefore insists that he be canonically deposed for his heresy.[64] Two special points are made: 1) that the emperor should see to it that Pyrrhus be sent to Rome; and 2) that it is entirely out of place to call one in Pyrrhus' position of a deposed patriarch by the patriarchal epithet: *most holy*.[65]

Here it is that the papal exhortations and request find a faithful echo in Saint Maximus. He had been asked by Peter, prefect of Africa, about the title to give Pyrrhus who had come there after his fall. Maximus replies at length, reviewing the whole history of the heresy. In direct answer to Peter's question he declares such a title wholly inapplicable so long as Pyrrhus remains separated from the Church, that is, equivalently, from the Roman see. He is therefore urged to make his peace with the pope of Rome and thus with the whole Church.[66]

This being the case, it is reasonable to suppose that Maximus was in touch with the Roman court, whose lead in the attitude to be taken to Pyrrhus he followed to the letter. There remains, however, an explanation to be found for the agitated tone of the whole letter and the vehemence with which he speaks of Pyrrhus. For this latter business it is enough to recall how Pyrrhus had been Martina's adviser at the time of the affair of George, that he was a great schemer for the new theology, and that finally he had come to that Africa where Maximus was himself the great defender of orthodoxy. For Maximus Pyrrhus must have been a most undesirable refugee; yet there he was and in addition expecting the patriarchal style. Quite enough to try Maximus' patience.

If then we have read this evidence aright, this vehement letter to Peter is not the first openly antimonothelite document from Maxi-

---

[64] MANSI 10, 704D.

[65] MANSI 10, 705A and 704A; 707C.

[66] TP 12 - 144AB and Df. It is only in Anastasius' version that we have fragments of this letter (a *defloratio*).

mus' pen, as Grumel supposes;[67] but the first time when he passes from a purely theological consideration of the question to the concrete arena of ecclesiastical life and personalities. The first datable (640) antimonothelite writing is Maximus' defense of Honorius in TP 20, which we have discussed above.[68] There are in addition a number of patently dyothelite opuscula which may only be dated from the fact that they expressly defend two wills in Christ.[69]

From the time of Maximus' letter to Peter about Pyrrhus (643) to the great dispute of July 645, between the monk and the expatriarch, we have no surely dated document. The dispute, however, has come down to us in its entirety as it was noted down at the time of the discussion and later copied at Rome before Pyrrhus had gone back on his profession of faith.[70] The sessions of the dispute were carried on in the presence of the patrician Gregory and of numerous bishops.

The impression on the African bishops of the victory there obtained and the impulse it gave to antimonothelite controversy is not small. The following year three councils were held in Africa to treat of the Monothelite question. Letters were written to pope Theodore, to the emperor, and to the patriarch Paul.[71]

Maximus could scarcely have had anything to do with these councils as it was in that year that he reached Rome, as also Pyrrhus.[72]

About the time of this conference Maximus composed his chief controversial work, addressed to his friend the priest Marinus. It is

---

[67] See n. 35.

[68] See item 49.

[69] I note some of these opuscula (the column number in parentheses is where explicit mention of two will is to be found): TP 6 - 65; TP 7 - 69 (77D); TP 8 - 89 (109D); TP 14 - 149; TP 16 - 184; TP 24 - 268; TP 25 - 269; TP 26 - 276.

[70] The text of this dispute (TP 28 - 287-354) has come to us through manuscripts copied at Rome, as the scribe's colophon indicates (353A11-B4)

[71] These letters may be found in MANSI 10. 919, 925, 929. It is uncertain whether there were actually three councils or but one composed of the three groups, from Numidia, Byzacenus, Mauretania.

[72] There is, so far as I know, no direct proof of the time of Maximus' arrival in Rome or whether he came there with Pyrrhus. There is only the inference from the second accusation recorded in RM 2 - 112Cff. This supposes Maximus to have been in Rome 9 years before — a supposition Maximus does not call into question. But 9 years before 655 is 646 (or only 647 ?). If then in Rome by 646, Maximus was there contemporaneously with Pyrrhus.

a remarkable piece of writing[73] from several points of view. The fragments that have been preserved contain some of the finest analyses of the acts of the will that have come down to us. This and the careful exposition of the relation of the wills of the saints to the divine will fully justify von Balthasar's dating: "certainly not before the Roman stay",[74] if it be understood as: certainly not before the fully developed controversy, that is before the dispute at Carthage. Such a date cannot well be questioned. The inference, however, that it was written in Rome is far less sure. In fact it can reasonably be argued that it was written in Africa (at Carthage?) about the time of the dispute.

The reason is the apparent reference to this polemic opus in a datable and placeable letter addressed to the same Marinus, priest of Cyprus. I refer to the epistle on the procession of the Holy Ghost and the orthodoxy of Honorius, excerpted by Anastasius.[75] Here Maximus refers to the "notebooks I have sent.. about the soul and other chapters".[76] This reference can easily be understood of the great polemic work to Marinus. There in fact we find first of all the careful analysis of the acts of the soul, after which some various chapters.[77]

The opuscule just cited, TP 10, may be dated between the years 642-46, with greater probability for the later years.[78] If this be so, the great work to Marinus will necessarily be about the same time.

Of this latter work perhaps the most remarkable trait is the introduction. In this close-packed paragraph Maximus manages to condense the whole of his ascetic and mystical doctrine. The very terminology recalls his early ascetical and antiorigenist works.[79] The

---

[73] See item 80.

[74] *Die Gn. Cent.* p. 153.

[75] TP 10 - 133-37.

[76] TP 10 - 137B7.

[77] Letters 6 and 7, both treating of the soul, can scarcely come into question; neither are addressed to Marinus, neither gives any suggestion of such a late date.

[78] See item 79.

[79] With "extending the motion of thy desire to infinity" (9A8), compare Amb 15 - 1220C where the infinity that surrounds God is represented as the limit of all mutation. With "eon and time" (9A6) compare ThOec 1,5. With the assigning of virtues to reason and contemplation (rather union — I would not accept Combefis' emendation; the scholiast knew only our text) to mind, compare the magni-

mainspring of all spiritual seeking is in full evidence — the insatiate desire of God;[80] likewise the insistence on the union of *theoria* and *praxis*. This summary then he places at the head of his chief antimonothelite treatise, without his feeling or without there, in fact, being any discrepancy or discord between the introduction and the body of the treatise. This is as much as to say that Maximus felt his doctrine, ascetic and dogmatic, to be a coherent whole. This connection of the two aspects of doctrine Maximus himself indicates in the second paragraph in which he outlines the questions to be dealt with.

After the dispute of July 645 or early the following year Maximus left Africa for the center of Christianity. It may be that he travelled thither with or about the same time as Pyrrhus. We may only gather from the *Relatio Motionis*[81] that Maximus was in Rome in the year 646 along with Pyrrhus.

It was not long, however, that Pyrrhus remained in Rome or faithful to Rome. His reversion to Monothelitism, whatever may have been its motive,[82] was the occasion of not a little bitterness. Shortly after this relapse Maximus reviews and refutes the Monothelite heresy in a letter to the Sicilian monks, apparently during a sojourn there. He felt it necessary to defend the orthodoxy of his former correspondence with the expatriarch.[83]

Roman Activity.

From this time on till his imprisonment Maximus remained in Rome or its vicinity. The biographer mentions this period as that

---

ficent development of the general motion of the soul in Amb 10 - 1112Dff., 1113D. On the joining of virtue and contemplation together with goodness and truth compare Myst 676A, 677D.

[80] See the preceding note, all of Thal 61 - 628Aff.; also KL 24/27 and 127f./103.

[81] RM 2 - 112C7. See nate 72. To take the interlocutors literally at RM 6 - 120C, the discussions with Pyrrhus would also have occurred at Rome.

[82] DUCHESNE, *L'Eglise au vie siècle* (Paris 1925) 439f., supposes the whole of Pyrrhus' double change of face to be connected with Gregory's revolt in Africa. The revolt a failure, Pyrrhus quickly reconciles himself with the imperial position. BRÉHIER, in FLICHE et MARTIN, *Hist. de l'Eglise* 5, 163 n. 3, reckons this mere conjecture.

[83] TP 9. The letter is addressed to "the superiors... in Sicily here." The phrase, "after the man's (Pyrrhus) complete deviation" (132C9) seems best understood of his reversion to the imperial fold.

of Maximus' most intense activity[84] in defense of orthodoxy, whether by conversations, by treatises, or by letters. Some of the incidents of this Roman stay have been preserved for us in the acts, thus his conversation with a certain Gregory, sent by the emperor, on the emperor's alleged sacerdotal prerogatives.[85]

Among the literary works is to be noted the tome to Stephen of Dora. This tome was written in Rome against the *Ecthesis*. It must then be of the year 646-47, before the new edict of 647, the *Typos*.[86] The tome is evidence of Maximus' activity. It contains 29 citations from the fathers and heretics relative to the disputed question. When was this *florilegium* gathered together? Was it Maximus' own personal work? What relations does it have with the later and fuller *florilegium* of the Lateran council?[87]

These questions do not concern us directly, yet the few references to *florilegia* in the writings ot Maximus and of Sergius are indicative of the slowness with which the orthodox reaction to the imperial heresy developed. In the early approaches with dissident Christians Sergius was ready with a *florilegium*, aside from the forged "libellus Menae." Thus in 619 he sent a *florilegium* to George of Arsas.[88] In 633 Maximus was unable to send Peter antimonophysite citations. He excuses himself by lack of books. But if a *florilegium* were then extant, reference to it might here be expected along with, at least, the recommendation to use Sophronius' learning.[89] Sergius, in his letter to Honorius (634), states quite plainly that Sophronius was unable to produce patristic passages of a clearly dyenergistic sense, though Cyrus had shown him some in a monenergistic sense at Alexandria.[90] This fact is reflected in the language of the *psephos*. Does it still obtain at the time of the *Ecthesis*, which repeats the earlier document?

---

[84] See the extra chapter edited by DEVREESSE, AB 46 (1928) 18, line 24ff.

[85] RM 4 - 113Dff.

[86] The *Typos* was promulgated in September 647, as DEVREESSE has pointed out (AB 46 [1928] 44) and also PEITZ (*Hist. Jahrbuch* 38 [1917] 219). Most authors continue to give 648.

[87] See the material assembled in PIERRES.

[88] TP 28 - 333A.

[89] ep 13 - 532Df. Monenergism is not properly in question in this letter. So properly it provides no evidence with regard to an antimonenergistic *florilegium*.

[90] MANSI 11, 532D, 533B.

Though a certain answer to this question cannot be given due to lack of evidence, it would seem that the orthodox *florilegium* in this controversy took shape only after the dispute at Carthage. If there had been one in circulation it would scarcely have been necessary for Maximus to send one to Stephen of Dora from Rome.

But Maximus' activity at Rome was not merely concerned with *florilegia*. These after all were gathered in support of a doctrine. His great work was in the formulation of doctrine in regard to the two wills and operations. Now the canons of the Lateran council, those that deal directly with the two wills and operations, employ terminology first found in this connection in Maximus. The inference is very well founded then that these canons, 10 and 11, were redacted if not by the confessor himself, at least by one who knew Maximus' thought well. The critical phrase, indicating at least a community of inspiration, is: Christ "is such in either of His natures that he naturally wills and effects our salvation".[91]

This is not the time and place to discuss the balance of this formula nor the Christological questions involved therein. Yet one should note that it is not an abstruse question of relations here considered, but one touching most closely each and every man — salvation. Consequent upon the natures, the distinction of wills and operations is preserved within the uniqueness of the person willing and operating the one work — man's salvation. The preeminence thus conserved to the divine, the operator in Christ, in view of man's salvation, is thoroughly characteristic not only of S. Cyril but of the Monophysites who claimed him as their great authority.

Arrest and trials.

Maximus' creative work was done. Nearly 70 when he assisted[92] at the Lateran council, there remained another 12 years in which

---

[91] The Greek runs thus: Christ in both His natures is θελητικὸν καὶ ἐνεργητικὸν τῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας. See TP 28 - 320C13; canon 10 of the Lateran council, MANSI 10, 1153E; see the latter text and discussion in PIERRES p. 12*ff.

[92] The evidence just discussed for Maximus' contribution to the work of the council would not require his physical presence there, however probable it may seem. There is one bit of evidence for that physical presence. The oriental monks resident at Rome at that time petitioned that a Greek version be made of the *acta*. Among the 17 signatures of the petition in third from last place occurs: *Maximus monachus similiter* (MANSI 10, 910 — the subscriptions are wanting in

he was to confess his faith alike in the two wills and operations of Christ as in the unity of the Church.

The emperor, Constans, was attentive to this development of affairs at Rome. In the first instance he sent Olympius, the exarch of Ravenna, to force acceptance of the *Type*. Due to the defection of Olympius effective action could only be taken at the death of the same (652). The 17th of June 653 pope Martin was arrested. Maximus was doubtless arrested at this same time.[93] In his trial, which came only in May 655,[94] every effort was made to fix political crimes[95] upon him. This failing, they had necessarily to come to the real crime in their eyes, that is his refusal to communicate with the see of Constantinople so long as she acknowledged the *Type* of Constans. The efforts fail, though the conversation with the two patricians makes it clear enough that the one great obstacle is the emperor's obstinacy.[96]

The upshot is a decree of temporary exile, to Bizya in Thrace ; for they still hope to bring him around to their view.

This effort is made the next year. A court bishop comes to interrogate him; Maximus prevails in the discussion which ends in hopeful anticipation. The emperor, however, is willing to show Maximus all honor on the sole condition of his adhering to the *Type*. With this second failure, Maximus was left in the hands of the soldiery, some of whom maligned him as being impious towards the

---

the Greek text). It is curious to note that an *Anastasius* follows. Was it Maximus the confessor and his disciple the monk Anastasius who signed this petition in fall of 649?

[93] The *Hypomnesticon* dates the troubles of Maximus from the 11th year of the indiction, that is from September 652 to August 653 (AB 53 [1935] 75 n. 17).

[94] The date *post quem* is certainly the consecration of pope Eugene (August 10, 654), as his apocrisaries have just arrived (RM 6 - 121B) in Constantinople. But the alleged communion of these apocrisaries with the patriarch took place on Sunday the 18th, Pentecost, that is May 18, 655. The whole process therefore took place in May 655. The patriarch in question is Peter. This Peter ascended the throne in May-June 654. So DEVREESSE (AB 49 [1928] 48f.) against BROOKS, May-June 655 (*Byz. Zeitschr.* 6 [1897] 53f.).

[95] BRÉHIER, in FLICHE et MARTIN, *Hist. de l'Eglise* 5, 171, 173, draws attention to the tribunal before which both Martin and Maximus were tried, that namely of the patriarchal *sacellarius*, to whom was committed the disciplinary jurisdiction of the patriarch. In other words, the crime in question was merely political, the ecclesiastical tribunal being necessitated by the clerical character of the accused. The *sacellarius* would not have been competent in a doctrinal case.

[96] RM 6 - 11.

Mother of God. Yet here again the Confessor won the people and the clerics to him so that they accompanied him so far as they might on the road of his exile.

The place of this second exile was at Perberis, like the first at Bizya, also in Thrace. Here Maximus remained 6 years.

For the emperor the chief culprit in the whole affair was pope Martin. He had died September 16, 655, shortly after Maximus' first trial. But so long as other opponents of his religious policy were recalcitrant the emperor would not remain content. Thus in 662 Maximus and the two Anastasius, the disciple and the apocrisary, were recalled to Constantinople for a further, definitive trial and punishment. This time the accusation no longer had any political tinge. The three remaining, most notable exponents of the orthodox doctrine in the east were summoned before a Monothelite council, where, together with Martin and Sophronius, they were anathematized and then turned over to the civil officer there present for the execution of the sentence — the mutilation of those members by which they had propounded the dyolthelite doctrine. Their tongues and right hands amputated therefore, they were taken about the city, exposed to the scorn of the populace, before being shipped off to their exile in Lazica, on the south east shore of the Black Sea.[97]

Arrived there the 8th of June 662, the confessors were at once separated, each dispatched to his individual place of exile.

Maximus, already broken with age and abusive treatment, died the 13th of August 662.[98] In spirit he was still and yet remains a strong, pure light of faith and of charity, of orthodoxy and of contemplation.

---

[97] The documents for the above account are:

1. deposition of Macarius of Antioch at the 6th council, 681, concerning the Monothelite council against Maximus, in MANSI 11, 357C;
2. Fragment of this council, MANSI 11, 73 and PG 90, 169Cff.
3. Letter of Anastasius the apocrisary to Theodosius of Gangres, PG 90, 171ff.
4. *Hypomnesticon* 1, AB 53, (1935) 67.

On the order and value of these documents see DEVREESSE (AB 46 [1928] 38ff.); for a succinct account of the whole affair see the notice of PEETERS mentioned in note 1.

[98] The death of Maximus is related in Anastasius' letter to Theodosius (PG 90, 174A12ff.) and in the *Hypomnesticon* 5 (AB 53 [1935] 75).

PART II

ANNOTATED DATE - LIST OF MAXIMUS' WORKS

A dating of Maximus' works would be doomed to failure if by that were understood a precise dating to year and month of all the several pieces. The greater part of the letters have lost their dating; historical details were of little interest to the copyists. The manner of dating then that I have employed is the following. Some letters form parts of a series, one letter dated, the others of the series are thereby relatively dated. However the most frequent means of dating is by assigning a particular item to a certain period of Maximus' activity on grounds which I have taken care to indicate in every case. In some 90 items in only 4 cases have I been forced to give no dating, and in only 15 have I assigned to a period by conjecture. These periods, the reasons for which I have manifested in the foregoing narrative, may be summarized as follows:

before 624/25	means before the Cyzicus stay
by 626	means during the Cyzicus stay
628-30	indicates the early African stay, a period of adjustment
630-33	still a period of adjustment, but looking forward to the *Pact of Union* (June 3, 633)
634-40	from the *Pact of Union* and Sergius' *psephos* (634) to knowledge of the *Ecthesis* (640)
640-42	the controversy becomes fully Monothelite and open between Rome and Constantinople, but the forces are not yet fully joined. In this period Maximus begins to disregard the *psephos*, renewed in the *Ecthesis*, forbidding discussion of one or two energies or wills
643-45	the controversy is fully joined; the affair of Pyrrhus' title *most holy* after his deposition
July 645 on	the dogmatic issues are settled in 649; controversy that follows is recrimination and imperial folly.

The purpose of these notes is not to be a finished product, but to provide a usable tool for others working with Maximus. Therefore I have not hesitated to mention all the works, though for many of them I have nothing to say or nothing of my own to add. For the necessary as well as the unnecessary defects of this essay I ask the indulgence of the readers; for its merits you have not so much myself to thank as Maximus himself who, for those who stay with him long enough to penetrate an unaccustomed manner of expression, still exercises that ascendancy which led his would-be popular accusers to escort him with honor on the first stage of his journey to exile (DB 31 - 169AB).

0 The Moscow Gnostic Century (EPIFANOVITCH pp 33-56).

This is the only dubious work, of any proportion, passing under the name of Maximus. Hausherr rejects it. In his judgment it contains nothing of Evagrius and likely nothing of Maximus. *Orientalia Chr. Per.* 5 (1939) 229. To be sure the latter part of the judgment is only an opinion; but the former should be well founded as he was then in search of Evagrian fragments. Von Balthasar, on the contrary, thinks that there can be no mistake: we have here to do with the work of Maximus most thoroughly committed to the Evagrian gnosis and which must be such an early work of his pen that he had not yet made contact with the Areopagite (*Die Gn. Cent.* 155). However he may not be so certain in this sense as the passage just referred implies. In the *Cosmic Liturgy* he states that from the beginning of his literary activity the confessor was acquainted with the Areopogite as well as Evagrius and Origen (KL 41/39). That cap. 8-17 of this Moscow Century are found in the "500 Capita" as 1, 6-15 proves nothing. If the first 15 of these chapters be genuine (see below item 37 a), it argues rather that the Moscow Century is a compilation. The example of artistic composition set forth by von Balthasar (*Die Gn. Cent.* 2, 3) proves only that those few chapters of which he treats are a coherent group, not that the whole century is a literary unit. Epifanovitch, who recognized the "500 Capita" as a compilation, reckons this century to be of the same sort. (I owe my knowledge of Epifanovitch's introduction to the kindness of the Rev. A. Raes, S. J.)

1 ep 5. To Constantine. Date uncertain.

There is no way of knowing who this personage might be, aside from being a noble acquaintance. Likewise there is no way of dating this little treatment of virtues and vices. ep 24 is inscribed to Constantine, the Sacellarius; but the identical letter is found in ep 43 inscribed to John the Chamberlain.

2 ep 22. To Auxentius. Indeterminable.

There are some letters whose date makes no difference whatsoever. In this brief note Maximus with the utmost of delicacy and true feeling chides a friend for not writing. I doubt if it can be surpassed in its kind. In Vat. gr. 507 and 504, to Abbot Stephen.

3 ep 42. Fragmentary. It seems written in a time of stress (637 A 12). When?

4 TP 22 - 257 - 60.

Combefis notes: from the oration of Gregory, patriarch of Constantinople, to the emperor, in Allatius. It consists of 2 citations from some dispute with Monophysites on Nicea and Chalcedon. Date?

5 ep 6. To the most holy and blessed Archbishop John: that the soul is incorporeal. Before 624-5?

Maximus here writes at the command of his correspondent without reference to scripture or patristic texts (425A); the result is therefore an enquiry, not dogmatic assertion (432C). He gives five series of syllogisms to prove his point.

Dating is difficult. If John be the bishop of Cyzicus, the letter must be before or after Maximus' stay there. As the letters after his flight from Cyzicus (ep 28-31) all show him very anxious to return. The absence of any such anxiety in this letter suggests that Maximus wrote this before his removal to Cyzicus (624-5).

The notions of man or microcosm and of comparing him with God (429 CD) are ones found in the *Mystagogia*. The notion of movement toward God, to play so large a part in *Ambigua* II, is already manifest (432 AB). The concept of natural energy is already present (432 B9). Should it therefore be dated five or six years later? It does not seem necessary.

6, 7, 8, ep 2-4. To John the Chamberlain. Before leaving Cyzicus (626). ep 3 is in thanks for a gift sent to the monastery of St. George. This monastery was to be found at Cyzicus (Erdek), for it is John, bishop of Cyzicus (ep 28-31) who is the pastor of the monastery. As is to be gathered from the preface of *Ambigua* II, Maximus spent some time there.

ep 2 is on love, perhaps the earliest little treatise that comes from Maximus. It certainly must predate the controversies for he speaks of one will between God and the saints (396C13). Similar language in the *Ambigua* (1076 C) he later corrected (TP 1-33 A).

ep 4 is on grief according to God. In the notice of Fabricius-Harles (in PG 90, 23-4 d) letter 4 is given as "ad Constantinum (fortasse sacellarium, ad quem infra litt. y" [= ep 24]).

9 ep 10. To John the Chamberlain. By 626 or 630-34.

John asks why, since all men are of one and the same nature and of equa worth, some are subjected to the rule of others. There is no external evi dence or reference for dating. The turn of thought fits well with Thal, th emphasis on the equal worth of men (449A) may be compared with PN (893B). (Also compare ThOec 1. 11 (and *Die Gn. Cent.* 29) - an Origenis theme.) It may come then from the Cyzicus period, before 626, or be con temporary with Thal, 630-4. Other letters addressed to John or referring t him are 2-4, 43, 27, 12, 44, 45 (ep B).

10, 11 On the Ascetical Life and 4 Centuries on Charity - 912. By 626

Von Balthasar (155) dates these along with the *Questions and Doubt* and the explanation of *Psalm 59* in the early period, by 626, it would seem. Pegon *(Centuries sur la Charité*, introduction et traduction de Joseph Pegon, S. J. Paris n. d. (1945) in the series "Sources chrétiennes") refuses to accept a date later than 630 (p. 24), but suggests (p. 21) between 618-25. But in fact the compilation of the centuries supposes a number of books on hand, as Pegon himself remarks. Yet if they were completely lacking in the exile after the Lateran council, Maximus himself testifies to his great lack of them in Africa in his letter to Peter (ep. 13-533A, a. 633-4). However Maximus could then have had the few ascetical codices necessary for the *Centuries* without having the far greater number of patristic codices necessary for forming a dogmatic florilegium. I would prefer to date them by 626, at Cyzicus.

Of the LA there exist 2 German versions: U. Garbas, Breslau 1925 and Fr. Murawski in *Führer zu Gott* Mainz 1926 and an Italian version by Cantarella (see item 27). Of the Centuries there is the Latin version of Cerbanus published by A. B. Terebessy (Budapest 1944 - see *Rev. d' hist. eccl.* 42 (1948) 384), the Russian version in the Russian *Philocalia* and the above-mentioned French version.

12 On Psalm 59 - 856. By 626.

There is no way of improving on von Balthasar's *early*. This one may even understand of the time at Cyzicus. Cantarella gives an Italian version (see item 27).

13 *Quaestiones et Dubia* - 785. By 626. A series of 79 questions and answers. It falls in the same class as Thal and Theop only that the questions are more varied, theological and scriptural, and the answers often as short as the question. Von Balthasar (155) classes it among the early works (before 626) and in fact any closer dating is impossible. Bardy *art. cit.* under Thal, item 36) studies this work as well.

14 TP 17 - 212 On defining distinctions. Of unascertainable date but probably early. By 626.

It consists only of a brief paragraph on contraries (soul and body) and contradictories (life and death).

15 TP 13 - 145. On the two natures in Christ. Date uncertain. Perhaps Crete 626/7?

This is an antimonophysite credal summary in ten brief statements (as to this type of summary in 10 statements see note on ThOec). Because of the lack of any Monenergistic or Monothelite controversy it might be dated before 634 (Maximus' dispute with the Severian bishops in Crete would have been an occasion for the redaction of this document — see TP 3-49c); yet this is not decisive as the letters to Cosmas and Peter written 634/6 - 640 show. The milieu for which such a document is composed is chiefly responsible for its particular antiheretical character. Its phrasing has reminded me of the *Ambigua,* but that can provide no firm argument.

16 ep 28. To bishop Kyrisikios. 626-32.
17 ep 30. To bishop John. 626-32.
18 ep 29. To the same (Kyrisikios). 626-32.
19 ep 8. See the next item.
20 ep 31. To the same (John). 632.

These form a group of which there can scarcely by any doubt though the lemmata of the first two in Combefis' edition indicate a bishop Kyrisikios as the correspondent. This was the reading Photius found in his ms. Yet Combefis' suggestion (accepted by Grumel, v. Balthasar, *Die Gn. Cent.* 152,[45]) of considering Kyrisikios as a corruption of Kyzikenos is almost forced upon us by the unity of matter. The author is a recent exile, due to flight before the barbarians, ardently desiring to return to his own monastery, yet prepared to accept his exile. The circumstances are verified but once in Maximus' life and have to do with his flight from St. George's monastery, Cyzicus, where we know he was accustomed to confer at length on a variety of subjects, especially theological (Amb 1, 1064B), with the bishop John.

The order of the letters seems to have been disturbed. In ep 29 (621C7) the bishop has received back some exiles; in ep 30 there is still only the petition to be received as in ep 28. In ep 3 Maximus thanks his friend John the Chamberlain for gifts sent to St. George's monastery. The present group of letters yields the following information: religious communities, especially the monastery of St. George have been dispersed (625C); some of the religious have gone a great distance (621A16) and may be gone definitively (625C); others probably are close at hand (625A16); the priest George is the superior of the community (625C); Maximus wants to return to St. George's but is resigned to stay away (625C); Bishop John has

brought back the community (621C) and has already received a community of nuns, Abbess Eudocia (625B).

The dispersion will be that caused by the simultaneous attack of Avars and Persians on CP in 626. The letters will then be scattered over the few following years. As it seems necessary to add ep 8 to this group, the term of this nostalgia for St George's Cyzicus may be given for 632, the date of ep 8. ep 31 will close the group, as showing already a greater degree of resignation, which will be completed after the departure of Sophronius. This acceptance of exile I take to be the purport of ep 25 (item 45).

19 sq. ep 8. Of the same to the same. 632.

Devreesse (RevScrel 17 [1937] 25-35) has published the end of this letter with its account of forced baptism of Jews on Pentecost 632. The date therefore is indubitable; the correspondent does not seem so certain. The mss are quite uncertain as to the inscription of this letter. First observe that ep 7 and 8 follow one another only in Paris. gr. 888. The longer version, with the conclusion on forced baptism, is generally inscribed to Sophronius Eukratas, the shorter to Jordanes; yet in 2 mss (Barroc. 128, end of 11th cent, and Marcian. 136, 13th century) it is addressed to John the priest. Some mss (Vat. gr. 504, 507, Barberini 587) give both recensions. The inscription to Sophronius seems to me impossible, that to Jordanes problematical, that to John the priest (understanding the bishop of Cyzicus) alone probable.

It will be worthwile to summarize first what we know of Sophronius from Maximus' own pen; it will then be possible to see if the indications of the epistle may be reconciled with the inscription. Maximus speaks of Sophronius three times, TP 12, the dispute with Pyrrhus, ep 13.

One of the things that provokes Maximus is that the Monothelites blame Sophronius for forcing them to enunciate their doctrine (TP 12 - 141C, cf TP 28 - 332Bff). He then goes on to say of him: "Sophronius, who with me and all the stranger monks stopped in the Africans' country" (142A). After several other excerpts he comes to the affair of the *Pact of Union* at Alexandria, June 3, 633:

> Sophronius therefore, the great and divine, arriving then at Alexandria, immediately on the first reading (for Cyrus had given him those nine impious chapters for revision) dolefully, plaintively cried out, shedding fountains of tears, fervidly begging, beseeching, expostulating with him, prone at his feet, that he pronounce none of these things from the pulpit against the Catholic Church of God (143CD). (This is the sole evidence we have that Maximus was with Sophronius at Alexandria, see items 76 and 44).

It is shortly after this incident that Maximus has occasion to speak of Sophronius to Peter (ep 13, item 44) in these words:

> The texts of the fathers corroborative of the Church's faith I have not yet been able to insert in the treatise (that just sent to Peter in this ep 13)

because of a severe lack of books here with me. There, however, you have my blessed master, father and teacher, mister abbot Sophronius, truly prudent (sophron - a kind of pun Maximus enjoys, ep 1 - 392B2, ep 31 - 626C, as Diehl remarks, *L'Afrique byzantine,* 543[2]) and wise advocate of the truth and undefeated defender of the divine dogmas, capable by deed and word of struggling against every heresy; and in addition to all other good things, rich in the plenty of divine books and willingly enriching those who want to learn divine things. I am sure, by visiting him you will acquire a complete and sure knowledge of the divine and saving dogmas. Farewell. (532 D12 ff.)

The dispute with Pyrrhus gives us a short summary of the first development of Sergius' activity for a dogmatic compromise. Note that this is again given by way of exculpating Sophronius, then "recently become patriarch of Jerusalem," who had brought up the questions of energies at an inopportune moment (332B). Then after mentioning various acts of Sergius with which Sophronius had nothing whatsoever to do, Maximus continues:

When Sergius had variously published abroad his own disease and had done damage to a great part of the church, then blessed Sophronius with all the humility due to his office, lying prone before him and for his own entreaties offering the life-giving sufferings of Christ-God, admonished him not to renew the terms of heretics that the holy fathers, already finished this life, had well put out — how then was he the cause of so great a scandal (333AB)?

Maximus then knew Sophronius in Africa and lived with him in an exile Byzantine community called, it would seem, after Sophronius (monks of Eukratades — ep 12 - 461A14). Sophronius was in Alexandria June 633, shortly thereafter at CP with Sergius, and then was made patriarch of Jerusalem.

From this information we may infer that Maximus came to know Sophronius in Africa and there became his monk and disciple.

Now in this letter 8, written in 632, Maximus beseeches to be received back under the protecting wings of his correspondent, if the fear of barbarians really be past, on account of whom he had made such a long sea voyage (445A). Now if this correspondent be Sophronius, it is, in fact, he not Maximus who has just made a sea voyage: it is Maximus not he who remains in the monastery where once they were together.

If, however, the letter be taken as addressed to John bishop of Cyzicus Maximus' circumstances are readily explained and are, in fact, found in the group of letters addressed to that bishop (ep 28-31). The relation is particularly close with ep 29. There occurs therein the same reference to wolves (444A, 621D), and, what Combefis already had observed, the same phrase, "tube of teaching" applied to the correspondent and not found elsewhere (441D *ult.,* 621C7).

One difficulty remains. Why should Maximus have addressed two such

similar letters to the same man? Ep 29, perhaps, came first; it is brief as the others of its group. Ep 8 is more elaborate, note the application of Psalm 22 to the pastoral office (441CD), but has its own *raison d'être* manifest in the recently published conclusion on the forced baptism of 632, omitted by some scribes, as not being a " precious titbit ". The interval between the two letters was likely enough short, a fact that would explain the reminiscences of one in the other. That we have here two correspondents, John and another, can hardly be admitted, inasmuch as the relations between him and Maximus and the circumstances could scarce be verified for two men.

21 ep 21. To the most holy bishop of Cydonia. 627-33?

This is a prime example of the fine art of turning a compliment which has, notwithstanding, a solid theological content. The occasion of this note was a request of the bishop. Apparently Maximus did not satisfy it.

Cydonia is a town in Crete of importance after Knossus and Gortyna (see Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll 11 2306 - Kydonia [1]). Maximus stopped in Crete, probably on his way to Africa (TP 3-49C). There he made the acquaintance of this bishop. The letter may date from the next few years (627-33). The term *apeiria* (604B 11) occurs frequently in the *Ambigua*.

22 TP 18 - 213. Definitions of unions. 626-33.

Twelve types of union are specified with indication of the uniting subjects. The first and second as the eleventh and twelfth are definitions of essential and hypostatic unions. The third definition (of habitual (kata schesin) union — ἐπὶ τῶν γνωμῶν εἰς ἓν θέλημα) would seem to place the whole group in the early period of ep 2 and *Ambigua* II (see the notes on these pieces). Leontius of Byzantium has a similar listing of unions (PG 86, 1925C).

23 TP 23 - 260. Chapters on ousia and nature, hypostasis and person. 626-33.

My numbering of the opuscula has here included three disparate items, that had better been assigned proper numbers. The title and date above apply only to the first item.

This first item consists of 10 chapters (not numbered in the text; for other sets of 10 chapters see note on ThOec). These deal with the terms ousia, enousion, hypostasis, enhypostaton - terms derived from Leontius of Byzantium. There follow two definitions — one from Clement of Alexandria, one with the lemma: definition of hypostasis of the all-wise Maximus.

After a dash in mid-page (used generally to separate one opusculum from the next) the second item follows: 7 chapters of Eulogius of Alexandria on the 2 natures of ou Lord and Savior Jesus Christ (264D - 265C4).

Finally after another dash comes the third item — 8 brief definitions with the title: of ousia and nature and hypostasis (265C5-268A).

Catalogues of mss give the following information. Vat. gr. 504, a. 1105, with the related mss, so it seems, Vat. gr. 507, a. 1344, and 508, 14th century, present 2 items. Vat. gr. 504 f. 146v item 203 gives TP 23 to 264C1, item 204 gives from 264D1 to the end with a subdivision indicated for 265C6. The definition of the all-wise Maximus is omitted. Ferrara 144, 14th century, gives only the first part (to 264B4) excluding also the citation from Clement.

The connection however of ten chapters with patristic citations is given in Epifanovitch's 17th item (p. 66f): *On wills and energies 10 chapters with patristic proofs.* No texts follow.

The tenor of the first part and its Leontian aspect suggest an earlier date (626-33).

24 ep 7. To John the priest: That after death the soul retains its intellectual activity and is separated from none of its natural powers. 628 (643 ?).

The addressee according not only to Coisl 90 (Grumel, EO 26 (1927) 26 n. 1) but also according to half a dozen other mss is not John but Jordanes. So far I have not found John indicated as the addressee. On the 2nd of August of the first indiction Maximus received a communication from Jordanes, by means of a common friend. Combefis notes only 643 for this first indiction, but 628 seems not merely possible but more probable.

The correspondent asks that Maximus refute the error of some monks who held the resurrection to be to this life as it now is and that the soul in the interim ceases from all activity.

436AB gives a clear statement of natural properties, a doctrine so important in the controversies over energy and will in Christ.

437AB speaks of the soul in a way very similar to ep 6 and the *Ambigua II.*

25 On the *Our Father* - 872. Brief exposition of the prayer *Our Father* to a lover of Christ. 628-30.

Von Balthasar simply lumps this with the *Mystagogia* and *Ambigua*, noting in addition affinities with the *Quaestiones ad Thalassium* (*Die Gn. Cent.* 154). One may note, however, more precisely the loose terminology concerning will and gnome, that later he corrected. Thus he speaks (877B6) of angels and men rejoicing in one and the same will, much as in *Amb II* 1076C, ep 2 - 396C, corrected in TP 1-28D, 33A. In 877D Gnome is attributed to the Lord, an attribution he takes great care later on to refute.

26 *Ambigua* II-1061ff (*Die Gn. Cent.* 152, on arriving in Africa about 630). 628-30. The arrival in Africa cannot be dated more precisely (see my article

in: *Am. Bened. Review* 1 (1950) 349f.). It should be noted that the actual composition is to be placed in Africa, the matter, however, was all worked out at Cyzicus, (1064B7) that is by 626. It is in these *Ambigua,* more explicitly 7 1068 - 1101 (the 2nd of Amb II), that we find the refutation of the Origenists. Maximus acquaintance, therefore, with Origen must be placed well before that year.

It is Maximus himself who numbers the chapters of the *Ambigua.* In TP 1 - 33A10 he refers to the 7th chapter (1076C). This however is only the 2nd chapter of the earlier *Ambigua* of which we are here speaking. Maximus must therefore himself have joined the *Ambigua* addressed to Thomas to our present ones addressed to John. The introductory epistles are not counted in the numeration (correct von Balthasar 153f.). There are thus 5 chapters in *Ambigua I* and 66 (6-71) in *Ambigua II.* Cappuyns *(Jean Scot Erigène* [Paris 1933] pp. 162-72) gives the divisions found in Scotus' version.

There is as yet no thorough analysis of these chapters, yet it is here that one finds, perhaps alone in all Greek patristic literature, a refutation of Originist error with a full understanding of the master (von Balthasar KL 97/81).

27 *Mystagogia*-657. What things are symbolized by the cermonies of holy church at the time of the synaxis 628-30.

I have nothing to add to von Balthasar's discussion (*Die Gn. Cent.* 154), save to note the affinities, especially microcosmos, that may be observed with ep 6. Versions have been made in French: Mme. Myrrha Lot-Borodine, *Irenikon* 13 (1936) 466 and for the next two years; and in Italian *La Mistagogia ed altri scritti* Florence 1931 (text and version on opposite pages). There exists also a Turkish version (see Grumel, DTC 10, 452) and a Greek résumé done into Latin by Anastasius the Librarian (S. Pétridès, *Rev. de l'Orient chr.* 10 (1905) 289 and 350).

28 ep 43. To John the Chamberlain.

ep 24. To Constantine *Sacellarius.* 628-9. The two letters are identical save for the inscription. From the reference to the world-wide peace (637C6, 608C12 (Combefis dates them after the victory over Chosroes (628). Maximus improves the occasion of the announced peace to exhort on the spiritual life. In it occur some of the clearest expressions that this life is one deriving from grace (640C2, 609C11). He was far distant (637C2 608C9) from his correspondents; was he already in Africa?

Combefis (607 note) prefers to suppose that scribes confused the inscriptions rather than that Maximus addressed the same letter to two men.

29 ep 27. To John the Chamberlain. 628/9? This letter is a recommendation of the bearer to the good offices of John (620A12 cf ep 44 - 644D8). The whole first part of this letter (617C - 620A, especially 620A4ff.) plays

with the idea of physical separation and spiritual presence in a way that recalls ep 43/24 (637C2, 608C9). One is lead to suppose that this distance from CP is still something new and unaccustomed (similar plaints on distance, from Cyzicus, are found in letters 28-31; ep 13). The date more probably would be shortly after his arrival in Africa. This would seem to be 628/9 according to the indications of ep 43/24. But as the theme is more fully developed in ep 27, it may well predate ep 43/24.

30 ep 23. To Stephen the priest. 628/9? Of uncertain date, perhaps, because of the play with physical absence due to great distances and spiritual presence, this letter is to be assigned to Maximus' first years in Africa. The same play is found elsewhere (see note to ep 27, item 29).

In the known epistolary of Maximus there is only one other mention of a Stephen priest, ep B, where he is also called superior, but see item 2.

It may well be the same Stephen. In ep 23 the second person plural is used throughout, even for the vocative (608A13), *reverend Fathers.* They are termed *disciples and teachers of love,* while Maximus calls himself their *child* (παῖς) *and disciple.* The plural vocative indicates that a community is addressed in Stephen — he might well then be its superior. The term *child* is unusual as a mere term of courteous humility. It may indicate that Maximus reckons himself the spiritual son of these fathers. They would then in all probability be the community at Chrysopolis where first he learned the monastic life.

Ep B (item 71) addresses Stephen as priest and superior; then as master (despotes - common for any reverential address) and teacher (Epifanovitch p. 85 line 10, 11). I pray you, he says, when you are in CP (παρακαλῶ σε... ἐν ΚΠ γινόμενον). This turn of phrase indicates one not habitually resident in CP, but living near enough that Maximus may suppose his presence there in need. But the monastery at Chrysopolis would have been just such a place.

31 ep 9. To Thalassius, priest and abbot. 628/30? There is no means of dating this letter, except after Maximus' arrival in Africa, on the supposition that he there made the acquaintance of this priest-monk, a Lybian, an African. This would be the opinion of Diehl (*L'Afrique byz.* 548[3]) and of Disdier (" Le témoignage spirituel de Thalassius le Lybien " *Études Byz.* 2 (1944) 80)

This latter likewise supposes a relation of friendship between the two as between an older (Thalassius) and younger man. That Maximus calls himself servant and disciple of Thalassius (449A) need not be taken in the strict sense; it is sufficient that Thalassius was abbot and priest. Maximus simple monk. There is a simpleness and ease about this letter (on the motives of man's actions) which indicates the intimacy of peers. See also epp 26, 40-42, A; Thal.

32 ep 26. To Thalassius priest. After 628. On pagan kings sacrificing their sons and appeasing the wrath of God. The text supposes the title. Salutation and farewell are wanting. Could this be from some " Quaestiones et responsa ". No indication of date; yet as Maximus probably came to know Thalassius only in Africa, after 628.

33 ep 20. To Marinus the monk. Early African stay (628-30).

This is a purely ascetic letter written with a view to edification against Maximus' own inclination at the insistence of the revered superior (597D). Such a state of mind suggests an earlier rather than a later date. Africa is likewise suggested on the supposition that in his flight Maximus passed through Cyprus and so made his acquaintance.

Combefis has raised the question whether this Marinus might not be identical with the other Marinus's to whom Maximus wrote. The titles of these other writings run as follows:

TP 7-69 Dogmatic tome sent to Marinus deacon in Cyprus. c. 642.

TP 20-228 Dogmatic tome to the priest Marinus, by 640.

TP 19-217 Replies to the difficulties of Theodore addressed to Marinus the priest. 642 or after.

TP 10, 1-3, 3^{abc} - 133,9. To Marinus the very pious priest. 645-6.

No difficulty hinders the identification as one person if Marinus monk deacon and priest is so addressed in letters in chronological sequence. However TP 7 in which there is mention of the *Ecthesis* I have dated as c 642; it is addressed to Marinus the deacon. TP 20, addressed to Marinus the priest, I have dated earlier for there is no reference to the *Ecthesis*. On the other hand this letter is a commanded letter with set difficulties; Maximus may have thought to have done enough by the *Ecthesis* in TP 7. Further there is no guarantee that the titles are free from error. Vatopedi 57 (13th cent.) and Ferrara 144 (14th) give a fuller title to TP 1: " On various chapters, to Marinus the priest of the church of Constantia in Cyprus ". The latter ms calls him also *oeconomus*, an official not unlike the vicar general in a modern western diocese. See the incidental description of the office in the acts of Chalcedon, Schwartz *Acta Conc. Oecum.* 2, 1 [359].

34, 35 sq ep 40,41. To Thalassius, priest and abbot. 630-34. (*Die Gn. Cent.* 152) The 40th is fragmentary; they both refer to a command which Maximus will be able to fulfil in the course of the winter. This apparently would be the *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*. Abbot Thomas seconds this request. See ep 9 (item 31) for considerations on Thalassius.

36 sq Thal *Quaestiones ad Thalassium* between 630 (the date of *Ambigua* II, Thal 39 - 393B refers to Amb 65 - 1389C-93B) and 633-34, there being in Thal no reference to Monenergism (*Die Gn. Cent.* 152f). Aside

from the considerable use von Balthasar makes of this great work in his *Cosmic Liturgy,* there is only the brief study of Bardy (*Rev. biblique* 41 (1933) 332-39) on the hermeneutic of Maximus. A thorough doctrinal analysis of this work is needed.

The scholia are marked by several apostrophes to Nile, a disciple of John Italos (middle of the 11th century). See in Thal 409A, 508C, 661A. The scholion to ThOec 2.21 in Vat. gr. 504 (a. 1105) addresses Nile. Similarly for TP 2, Vat. gr. 1502 (11th-12th century) addresses Nile in a scholion, but in a later hand. Now the Grottaferrata ms of Maximus (B α IV, before 992) contains the scholia for Thal except those apostrophizing Nile; the main body of the scholia are therefore of the tenth century, not as heretofore thought of the eleventh.

37 200. Gnostic Chapters / 200 chapters on theology and incarnation 1084ff. (*Die Gn. Cent.* 155 - a little before 634 - Sophronius' Synodical letter). 630-4. Von Balthasar notes the dependence of these centuries on Thal and Amb II. A thorough study of these relations depends on a thorough analysis of these works, which is yet to be made. The same author likewise has noted the first group of "Gegenmotive" 1.1-10. He has not noted however that such a group of 10 sentences is a variant of the century form used not infrequently by Maximus. See TP 13-145 10 sentences on two natures, TP 25 - 269 ten on two wills (also TP 23 - 260-264B4) and the ten chapters on wills and operations in Epifanovitch p. 66; ThOec 1. 1-10 therefore may well have once stood by itself as a concise summary of Maximus' philosophico-theological position in the face of the Evagrian and Origenist error. If, however, the authenticity of the whole two centuries be allowed, as I think it should, these 10 initial sentences assume a critical importance — they give the framework in which Maximus understood and wished to be understood the following sentences, taken so largely from Origen and Evagrius.

The conjectures of von Balthasar (KL 42/40) on these centuries and the Origenist crisis are not very fortunate. Maximus lived in community, whether at Cyzicus, Africa or Rome, till his imprisonment in 652-3. The sojourn at Alexandria is dubious. One can scarcely maintain at once the literary coherence of these two centuries, as does von Balthasar, and speak also of the obscuring of Maximus preferred theological principles, when precisely he opens them with a very forceful summary statement of those very principles by which he refutes Origenism.

37a Cap. ie' 1177A- 1185C5. Time of ThOec. I see no reason for denying the direct paternity of Maximus for these first 15 chapters of the "500 Capita". They occur alone under the rubric: Of the same St Maximus 15 chapters (Cryptof. 683 f 56ra) in 14 mss from the end of the 9th century

to the 14 th (9th cent.: Pal. gr. 49 f232; 10th cent.: Cryptof. 683, Marcian. 137; 11th cent.: Marcian. 570, Barroc. 128; 12th cent.: Vat. gr. 504 f116 a. 1105, Vat. gr. 1646 a. 1118, Angelica 120; 13th cent.: Pal. gr 91, Marcian. 494, Escorial 270 Y III 3, Paris. gr. 886 f317v, 14th cent.: Ferrara 144, Vat. gr. 451 f 35v). DISDIER (EO 30 (1931) 160-178) identifies our chapter 15 with PseudoMark *Capita de temperantia* 26 (PG 65, 1064C), but this Pseudo-Mark is posterior to Maximus (see the most recent author I. A. KHALIFÉ "L' inauthenticité du De Temperantia de Marc l'Ermite" *Mél. de l'U. de S. Joseph de Beyrouth* 28 (1949-50) 61-66); the borrowing is from Maximus. Our chapter 5, generally but a few lines are given, is ThOec 2.1. As to the Maximian quality of these chapters, compare cap. 3 with Thal 13 - 296BC. As there is no criterion of date, I join it, also for time, as do the mss in contiguity, to ThOec.

38 ep 17. To the Alexandrian scholastic Julian, about the Church's doctrine on the Incarnation of the Lord. By 633.

Maximus first of all congratulates Julian and another scholastic Christopemptus for their steadfastness in the right doctrine. He then adds a brief exposition of this doctrine in view of a purely Monophysite position. This would not have been possible in writing to Alexandrians after the Monenergistic pact of Union of June 633.

Is it possible that we are here dealing with Alexandrian refugees. Julian has forwarded by Maximus a petition to the eparch (584C). The nuns mentioned as in Alexandria in the title of ep 18 are probably refugees (see my note, item 67).

39 TP 21-245. On quality, the proper and difference, to Theodore priest in Mazaria (Sicily). 633? 646?

Theodore had requested this exposition (248B). After explaining the above-mentioned terms (248,249), Maximus attacks Severus for supposing these same things to have existed in Christ as not in a substance and for his notion of a composite nature (252A - 256D).

The concluding reference to drawing near to God by "knowledge (*episteme*) of things" reminds one of the *Ambigua* and the *Centuries on Charity.*

The last suggests a date by 633. However TP 1 begins with a passage on the spiritual life that stands in close connection with the early works, yet its date is 645.

The complete lack of Monenergistic reference is likewise no sign of an early date, as is seen in the correspondence with Cosmas.

The addressee is in Sicily; was Maximus' visit there 646-48 (see TP9) the occasion of Theodore's request? Nothing proves it. But why is this letter among the opuscula? The opuscula are generally later and definitely

antimonothelite. Was then this letter written during Maximus' known Sicilian visit and therefore originally included among works of the later period?

40 TP 5 - 64. By 633.

This consists of three short responses to arguments of the Monenergists — namely that there is one operation insofar as the divine prevails over the human, or insofar as the divinity uses the humanity as an instrument or insofar as one composite operation is effected.

Clearly this belongs to the Monenergistic stage of debate; probably also before the *psephos* (634) as there is no hesitation in speaking of 1 and 2 operations.

41 *Quaestiones ad Theopemptum* - 1393, 630-33? Three scriptural texts are explained. Details for dating I have not observed. It belongs to the same class as Thal.

42 ep 19. To Pyrrhus, priest and superior. End 633, early 634.

Maximus replies to a communication of Pyrrhus, a treatise on the doctrine of energy (cf TP 9 - 129C), asking his opinion on the same (593C11 and 596A*ult.* f.). With this he must have received a copy of Sergius' *sentence* (*psephos*), to which he devotes more attention.

After unwonted praise of Pyrrhus (589C - 592B) Maximus accepts this *psephos*, precisely because it undoes the heretical innovation of the Pact of Union at Alexandria (592C1-4; it is for this that he calls Sergius a new Moses!). He then gives a brief summary of the faith which had thus been saved by the *psephos* taking care to state the fundamental principle of dyothelism (The necessary connection of nature with its proper operations and faculties - 593B1-5) and rather pointedly excludes a point made in the *psephos* (see below). He then compliments Pyrrhus on the accuracy of his doctrine, excuses himself for not writing the requested exposition, but asks incidentally for precisions on the sense of the terms *energeia* and *energēma* (596 B3f). He then recommends the monks, who are the bearers of his letter, to the kindness of Pyrrhus and expresses fear lest he should seem presumptuous.

Some 12 years later Maximus had to apologize for this letter (TP 9 - 129C-132C); he regrets the praise, he asserts the fundamental soundness of doctrine. An analysis of the letter, especially at the points indicated, bear this judgment out.

There seems to be no knowledge of Sophronius' Synodicon (dated at the end of 634 - Bréhier in Fliche-Martin 5, 123[1]) manifest in Maximus' reply. Its date therefore is almost certainly 634.

But the *psephos?* This is a document Sergius prepared on seeing the disputes arising from the Pact of Union (text in Mansi 11, 564ff), particu-

larly at the instances of Sophronius (letter of Sergius to Honorius, in Mansi 11, 533BC). Sophronius, according to an excerpt from Pyrrhus (Mansi 11, 572B) had objected above all to the 7th chapter of the Pact where a text of Denis had been altered from a *new theandric operation* to *one theandric operation*. Sergius, to avoid theological quarreling, simply forbade the use of the term *one or two energies*. This was the primary purport of the *psephos* for which Maximus could say that it undid the Pact.

But have we the text of this *psephos?* Grumel, in his studies on the history of Monothelitism, gave an extract from Sergius' letter to Honorius as the *psephos* (EO 27 [1928] 13), reprinting from Mansi 11, 536E3 - 537A *ult.* But in fact this is but a summary of the report on the affair that the patriarch sent Heraclius; naturally enough it gives the gist of the *psephos,* but not the text.

Now according to Maximus Heraclius declared the *Ecthesis* to be the work of Sergius, prepared five years before his return to CP (i. e. in 633). At Sergius' request he signed and published the document (The *Ecthesis* of 638; RM 11 - 125 AB). The text therefore of both documents should be the same. The *Ecthesis* has been preserved in the acts of the Lateran Council (Mansi 10, 992B-97A). It is a full exposition (therefore *Ecthesis*) of the faith. After expounding the Chalcedonian doctrine of two natures, this document proceeds to forbid speaking of one or two energies. Now it is here that a *verbatim* correspondence begins with a passage of Sergius' letter to Honorius, introduced by the words: We have written the patriarch of Alexandria... that he no longer permit anyone to speak of one or two energies in regard to Christ our God... (Mansi 11, 533C8).

The texts are identical save for the necessary verbal adjustments at the beginning and for half a dozen insignificant verbal variations. The portions parallel are, for the letter to Honorius (*psephos*), Mansi 10, 533C8 - 533E10 and, for the *Ecthesis*, Mansi 11, 993E10-996B7 (= EH 1070, 1071).

Sergius in his letter to Honorius then goes on to comment and defend the position thus taken up, stating finally that Sophronius, though agreeing not to speak of two energies, asked for an account of the affair in writing. This was given him. He thereupon left CP (Mansi 10, 536A-D7).

Likewise in the *Ecthesis* there follows upon the parallel text an explanatory passage (Mansi 11, 996B7-C10 - EH 1072, 1073), which not only overtly confesses one will, as Honorius had done, but endeavors to fix the opprobrium of Nestorianism upon the dyothelite doctrine. The remainder of the document is of slight interest save that Severus is included among the heretics anathematized.

It would seem therefore that in these parallel passages we have the actual text of the *psephos*, in so far as it was an authoritative decree in the dispute. A decree that settled nothing, a withdrawing from the position of the Pact of Union and all the while implying the rightness of that position. A decree necessitated and accepted by Sophronius, framed by Sergius

and, perhaps, approved by the permanent Synod at CP (Bréhier, Fliche-Martin 5, 120; DB 4-140C, which is the only referencc I know in Maximus suggesting that the *psephos* had also synodical authority).

The unsatisfactoriness then in both documents is not so much in the formally affirmed doctrine as in the constant innuendo that Monenergism or Monothelitism is the only doctrine that has real support in the fathers and tradition; only the unjustified scandal at the use of the phrase *one* energy has led to forbidding talk of either one or two energies. The *Ecthesis*, maintaining the ban as to the use of numerals with energies clearly affirms one will.

In the explanation of the *psephos* there is one point that Maximus seems particularly to refute in his reply to Pyrrhus. In the explanation pathos is ascribed to the humanity of Christ alone, energy (activity) to the Godhead alone (Mansi 11, 536B7ff). Replying Maximus writes: " He (Christ) works humanly what is divine... and divinely what is human " (ep 19-593A2f). One may suppose that Pyrrhus forwarded or that Maximus had before him the text only of the *psephos* (not therefore the consequent explanation from which the above distinction is cited). Yet that this distinction touches one of the points at issue is clear from its use in the Dispute of 645 (TP 28 - 349Cf). In any case Pyrrhus would undoubtedly have employed it in the tractate which he had sent to Maximus and which was precisely a full enquiry into the doctrine of energy (TP 9 - 129C10ff).

Other capital documents in the development of Maximus' attitude toward Monothelitism are TP 20, ep A, TP 12, TP 9.

43 *Ambigua* I - 1032. To the sanctified servant of God, spiritual father and teacher, sir Thomas, Maximus, humble and sinful, unworthy servant and disciple. 634 or shortly after.

I have nothing to add to von Balthasar's discussion (*Die Gn. Cent.* 150-52; there are clear indications that Monenergism has been broached). His date I accept. For the numeration of the difficulties see note on *Ambigua* II, item 26.

44 ep 13. To Peter the Illustrious. 633-4.

Maximus has just received a letter from Peter informing him of a sea voyage safely completed (509C6) and of the return of some recently ill-converted Monophysites to their error, a fact that Maximus had fully expected (512 BC).

There follows a short treatise against Monophysitism ending with the assertion that such is the faith of the fathers and the present bishops (532C).

For lack of a library he cannot supply the requested patristic passages, but better than that Peter can consult Abbot Sophronius, where he now is (532D - 533A).

If from a false accusation (RM 1 - 112 AB) one may adduce evidence — Peter was ordered in 633 to proceed from Africa to Egypt against the Saracens. It is known that Abbot Sophronius was in Alexandria in June 633. The bastard union referred to above (512BC) may well then be that of June 3, 633; the voyage consequently that from Africa to Alexandria.

As Maximus does not know of Sophronius' subsequent voyage to CP, this letter must be dated 633 or at the latest early 634.

45 ep 25. To Conon, priest and superior. 633 or after.

This short letter serves as an excuse for not coming as summoned (613B8). Maximus seems to regard this Conon as his proper superior, he excuses himself for disobedience in not coming, he calls him his father in God, protector, and guide of his salvation, asking the prayers of his community. If then Conon is truly superior for Maximus, it can only be after the departure of Sophronius and likewise after Maximus had gotten over the nostalgia evident in ep 28-31, 8. It is on this basis that I suggest 633 or after.

Maximus' excuse was bodily illness. Elsewhere there are references to his bodily condition. In TP 10 (137C1) he speaks of weak eyes. In the *Hypomnesticon* Theodore Spoudaeus speaks of him as "small and weak of stature" (Devreesse AB 53 [1935] 69[5]; PG 90, 195A *ult.*).

46 ep 15. To Cosmas the deacon, of Alexandria. After 634. (634-40).

This letter was requested by Cosmas (576A7) and is apparently that referred to in ep 14 (537C5). The main tone of the letter is simply antimonophysite; yet in the final summary exposition of faith there is a distinctly antimonenergistic passage (573B2-9) that is textually so similiar to and in part a verbatim parallel of ep 19 - 593A2-15 that a close mutual relation must be supposed (a less close parallel may be discerned with ep 14 - 537A9ff). Letter 19 is securely dated for 634.

The library wanting to Maximus in ep 13 (532D) has since been acquired, to judge from the citations (545f).

47 ep 14. To Peter the Illustrious. 634-40.

Cosmas (the deacon of Alexandria) is the bearer of the letter (533c8), who is now returning to his family and friends (536A2). Peter is asked to use his good offices with the "Godhonored pope" (536A4) who can only be Cyrus.

There follows a brief résumé of Cosmas' confession of faith (536A-537B). Cosmas had asked for a brief dogmatic exposition, which Maximus had already given him (537C5). This must be ep 15 as Combefis suggests. Peter is asked to supply from his knowledge what the brief explanation could not make plain.

Maximus devotes the rest of the letter (537D11ff) to present conditions. He speaks of a desert people overrunning lands not their own (540A9) and of the blood-thirsty Jews.

The date is therefore probably after 634-6 (The Arab conquest of Syria). ep 15, slightly previous to ep 14, is dated 634 or after. As no reference to Monothelitism is evident the *terminus ante quem* would be 640 (when Maximus heard of the *Ecthesis*). The same date is indicated by the reference to Cyrus, who left Alexandria in 640 not to return before summer 641 (14-9-641).

Presumably Cosmas is returning to Alexandria; Peter therefore is in that city.

Ordinarily ep 14 and 16 are reckoned as of about the same time, as referring both to Cosmas' conversion. This is not quite accurate. It is clear from ep 14 that Cosmas is newly converted, in need of further instruction. ep 16 speaks of Cosmas' steadfastness in the faith. Therefore an undetermined lapse of time must be supposed to intervene between ep 14, 15, and ep 16.

48 TP 4 - 56. To George, very revered priest and superior who asked by letter about the mystery that is in Christ. 634-40.

This letter seems to have been called forth by a request for a general exposition of the Christological mystery; therefore the polemic accents recede somewhat. There are however some phrases which suit the time after the *psephos* (634) and before the joined conflict of Rome and CP.

In 60A there is question of conflicting wills in Christ; but the impossibility of such a thing is Sergius' great argumeut for the Monothelite position. Note also how we are said to be rebellious *kata thelesin* (60A9f); in early works Maximus rather spoke of *stasis kata gnomen* (ep 2 - 396D, 400C12; cf PN - 877D).

After a bit Maximus touches on a text of Gregory Nazianzen (*or.* 30 [*de Filio*] 12: P.G. 36, 117C7) seemingly in favor of Sergius' doctrine of contrary wills, a text commented by Maximus at least eight times (TP 3 - 48B; 4-61Af; 6-65B3; 7-81CD; 15-161A and 176A; 20-233B and 236B; 28-316C). Of these documents none may be dated before 634/5. The presumption therefore stands for that as an earliest date. On the other hand the prohibition of the *psephos*, not to number energies, or wills, is still observed.

This George is presumably that of ep 29 and 31.

49 TP 20 - 228. Dogmatic tome to the priest Marinus, by 640.

Maximus has been asked to comment on some passages from the work of Anastasius I of Antioch (Patriarch 559-70, 593-99) against John Philoponus' *The Arbitrator*. These passages of the orthodox Anastasius had a distinctly Monenergistic ring (228-233A).

Another passage from the same author was his treatment of a *locus classicus* in Gregory Nazianzen that lent itself to a Monothelite interpretation (233B 237C).

In third place comes Honorius' letter to Sergius of 634 (see in EH 1058, 59; Mansi 11, 538f). This Maximus interprets in a quite orthodox sense, pointing out that Honorius was denying two morally contradictory wills in Christ (237C-244B). This interpretation he confirms by the reports of Anastasius, then coming to Africa, who had made inquiries at Rome as to the sense of this letter. He found them distressed and apologetic about the affair; further John, the clerk who had prepared the Latin text at Honorius' command, affirmed that in that text there was no mention of *one will* nor of a human physical will in our Savior. The text then had suffered manipulation at the hands of the translators (244C-245A).

This opuscule is important for the story of the development of Maximus' attitude to Monothelitism. It is clearly and overtly antimonothelite. A precise dating seems impossible. For a relative dating one may note: Maximus shows a knowledge of Honorius' first letter only (but likewise in The Dispute, 645, there is question only of the first letter (328Bf); there is no reference to the *Ecthesis*, nor to Pope John's letter to Constantine on the same subject in the year 641 (Mansi 10, 682 ff — EH 1074); the tone is calm throughout (in contrast with TP 12); the reference (245C) to Marinus' then bishop is satisfied most probably by Arcadius, (see *Arcadius*, 11, in *Dict. d'Hist. et de Géographie eccl.*), who was dead when Sergius of Cyprus (Arcadius' successor?) wrote to Pope Theodore, May 29, 643 (See Mansi 10, 916C4 and 916E *ult.*); this Arcadius was likewise dead at the writing of TP 12 (143B7). The present tome therefore must precede both these latter documents, before spring 643; it may easily have been written before Maximus knew of the *Ecthesis*, that is before 640 and perhaps before Honorius' second letter to Sergius (634/5-38).

John, the secretary and author of Honorius' letter, fulfilled the same role for Pope John in his letter to Constantine (TP 28 - 328C-329A).

50 TP 14 - 149. Various definitions. By 640.

This contains some 19 definitions of terms used in Trinitarian and Christological doctrine, especially as developed in the Monophysite controversies. Towards the end come definitions of energy and will (physical and gnomic will - 153A). As this latter distinction comes to the fore only later in the controversies (after 640), this collection of definitions, as it now stands, must date from not much before that time. It may be that the definitions of energy and will were added to a series already formed for Monophysite controversy. Yet the first definition of relational (σχετική) union, defining it as the bringing of different opinions to *one will* (152C), makes a date after knowledge of the *Ecthesis* highly improbable. The distinction of gnomic and physical will I have noted, by the way, in TP 2 and 3 (44CD

48D - of the year 645), in TP 7 (81D - of the year 642), in TP 20 (233C - by 640) and above all in TP 16 (*e. g.* 185D, 188B, 192BC). This last is a full treatise on the two wills in Christ and can scarcely be anterior to 643. The catalogues of mss indicate a varying tradition, the last two definitions or more being sometimes omitted.

Let us date this group as it now stands by 640.

51-54 ep 32 - 35.
55-58 ep 36 - 39. } Of the same to abbot Polychronios. Uncertain date.

The correspondent, whose name occurs only in the inscription of ep 32, is otherwise unknown. The epistles form two groups. The former, ep 32-35, ascetic, on dying and rising with the Lord, were written before Easter (625D) of an undetermined year; the tone is that of a master. The second group, 36-39, all Thank-you letters for spiritual and material care, are written as to a father. Maximus speaks for his community. The need of food stuffs does not necessarily imply the time of African exile, for Maximus thanks John the Chamberlain in a similar vein (ep 3) while he was still at Cyzicus. Are the two groups really addressed to the same person? The latter group I have so far found only in Paris. gr. 888, 17th century.

59 ep 11. To a superioress about a nun who had left the convent and repented. African stay.

This letter contains excellent considerations on God's mercy; but no sign of time. I would assign it however not before the African stay, for it was there above all that Maximus began to play a leading part; *cf.* ep 18 written for the prefect George to apostate nuns. Combefis suggests that this might be the superioress called *Jania* to whom a letter of Maximus was addressed according to Photius, codex 192 (PG 103, 648D).

60 ep A Mansi 10, 677: *ex epistola s Maximi scripta ad abbatem Thalassium de iis quae apocrisiarii fecerunt 638.* 640. Maximus' Constantinopolitan correspondents, from the clergy, describe the affair of Severinus' apocrisaries and the *Ecthesis.* Severinus was consecrated only May 28, 640 (Grumel EO 29 (1930) 24). Therefore the apocrisaries could not have returned to Rome before early 640. Maximus' friends write only after they have left (678C), that is late 639. Maximus, still in Africa, receives the news in early 640 together with a copy of the *Ecthesis.* Unfortunately the excerptor was not interested in Maximus' critique of this document. He breaks off with the brief summary Maximus gives of it. This is the last mention we have of Thalassius.

61 TP 8 - 89D. Copy of an epistle addressed to the most sacred bishop, sir Nikander, by saint Maximus, on two operations in Christ. c. 640.

The introduction indicates a predominantly Monophysite group of op-

ponents; the main body is concerned with the Monenergists. Yet the document is openly dyophysite (2 physical wills - 97C) and declares that the arguments presented against Monenergism are equally effective against Monothelitism (109C10).

Where was this Nikander bishop that a Monenergistic refutation was more urgent than a Monothelite one? The letter had been commanded (112A5).

The date must be about 640.

62 TP 24 - 268. That it is impossible to say one will of Christ. Early in the Monothelite stage. c. 640.

This brief refutation of Monothelitism seems to stand but one remove from the first instances when one will was clearly predicated of the one Christ. The Monophysite problematic and texts lie very close to the surface. Addressed to some certain but unnamed person, it uses irony and dialectic along with the innuendo of diverse heresies contained in the new doctrine. He provokes his antagonist to establish his Monothelitism by patristic teaching (269C9). Has Maximus already collected passages, such as we see in TP 15, 27? The term *thelētikos* does not occur (see item 77, TP 27). The date indicated therefore seems to be about 640, after Maximus' knowledge of the *Ecthesis* and his decision to disregard the precept of not speaking of one or of two wills.

63 TP 25 - 269. Ten chapters on the two wills of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ. They were written for the orthodox. c. 640

The different distinctions of will that are considered are physical, hypostatic, selective, gnomic. The matter is covered in ten chapters to which Maximus adds a post-script (273B11-D). In this he touches on the deceptiveness of like or identical terms for diverse things, noting that the fathers concerned themselves with things not words. And for that matter to write on this subject one must know, besides the fathers' use of words, the meaning of *choice* and *opinion* (*proairesis, gnome*). As to the time the case is the same as for the preceding opusculum (TP 24). As to the form in ten chapters see the note on ThOec and the references there given.

64 TP 6 - 65. 640-2.

A comment on the passage of Matthew: Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from me (Mt. 26: 39). We have here to do with a critical text in the Monothelite debate. It occurs in TP 3-48C; 7-80C; 16-196D; and above all in the tome to Stephen of Dora (TP 15-160C, 164C, 165AB, 169C). This would itself give a probable date to the opusculum. But there is more.

In 68A Maximus speaks of two wills (theleseis) and operations. There is no pretention therefore of observing either the *psephos* or the *Ecthesis*.

The opusculum would date then at least from the first period of open opposition, 640-2.

65 TP 26 - 276. From the things asked him by the monk Theodore. 640?

The paragraph first following this title contains definitions of the philosophers and of the fathers for *nature, ousia, individual, hypostasis.* On this there follows a small florilegium of 12 texts, the last two of which are from Maximus' own work.

From the diversity of editions at this point, Combefis (note j, col. 273) supposes the florilegium here printed to be that which the concluding note of TP 25 (273CD) might lead one to expect. The paragraph of double definitions would then be an intrusion, dividing two parts of the same work. Should this be verified, the compiling of the present texts would be assigned to the same time (c. 640).

Combefis proposes to identify the Theodore of the title with Theodore of Raithu. Franz Diekamp rejects this ("Analecta Patristica" p. 176 - *Or. Chr. Analecta* 117 Rome 1938). It seems useless to conjecture another identification. Nor is there anything in the piece itself to suggest a date.

G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (London 1936) 279, criticises the definition given here of *ousia* according to the fathers as representing the shift from a concrete sense to the abstract, logical sense. The same may be said for *physis.* See ep 15. Yet in anthropological contexts Maximus retains the concrete universal found in Gregory of Nyssa to whom he owes much in these matters. See Thal prologue, 253ff; 1-269; 63-628 and 632A especially; Gregory of Nyssa *de hom. opificio* 16, PG 44 - 183BC.

65a *Computus ecclesiasticus.* To the patrician Peter. Between October 5, 640 (the beginning of Heraclius' 31st year) and the news of Heraclius' death (February 11, 641) reaching Africa. The date is given in part 3, chap. 9. Petau's edition is reprinted in Migne, PG 19, 1217-80. It was from this *computus* (1, 32 and 34 = PG 19, 1249B9-C5 and 1252C) that was excerpted the "Chronologia succincta vitae Christi" published by Bratke in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 13 (1892) 382-84.

66 sq ep 12. To John the Chamberlain. Nov.-Dec. 641.

The question of the affair of George, Eparch of Africa, touched upon in these letters (ep 12, [18], 1, 44, B, 45) will be treated synthetically after presenting a précis and critique of the single letters in their narrative aspect. The figures are those of Migne's columns.

(460Aff) In November of the 15th year of the current indiction (641) the chancellor Theodore arrives, bringing letters written by Martina, Patrician, addressed to the Eparch (George), ordering the release of the nuns of the monastery of Abbess Joannias of Alexandria and of the monastery called "Sacerdos", both of the Severian heresy.

Theodore brought no other dispatch from any other minister of Martina at CP.

Maximus is consequently at a loss to know why John has not written him on this affair, especially as it clearly would be a scandal as damaging her reputation for orthodoxy.

In order to avoid trouble already rising the eparch declared the letter forged and made a show against the chancellor and proceeded against the agitating heretics from Alexandria and Syria, imprisoning some, beating others for impugning the Patrician's good name and for asserting, on the basis of this letter, that she was of their opinion, even that (461A) one Thomas, said to be their bishop, was one of her entourage and her councilor. This most of all was a scandal to the people. To such an extent indeed that Maximus himself was called and had to interview personally those who talked in this fashion and assure his auditors that neither she nor her departed husband had ever had any attachment for the heretics. Other monks of the Eucratades monastery did likewise. All this to clear her name. (461 B)

But still there remains a doubt. Maximus knows the upbringing of the Patrician well, that it was nothing if not Catholic. Yet the said Theodore swore great oaths in vouching for the authenticity of the letter. If he is really telling the truth, then John has committed grave sin in cooperating with error and heresy. One may on no account aid heretics as heretics, that is in their heresy (464B5).

In fact George had acted on this principle from the beginning. He had given them (the above-mentioned nuns) a house and furnishings; but they had carried on active Monophysite propaganda, especially with young girls and would hear nothing of his remonstrances. Forseeing the grave danger and scandal to the native Christians, he consulted the local bishop and notables, asked the emperor and the patriarchs of Rome and CP. Alike from the superior and the patriarchs he received the reply to drive all heretics, persisting in their evil opinion, from the country; and the nuns that accepted Catholic communion to leave in undisturbed possession of their monasteries, those however that refused obedience to the truth and the imperial regulation to divide up among orthodox convents, confiscating their goods to the public treasury (465A).

This he did with zeal. All the heretics from Syria, Egypt, Alexandria and Libya accepted Catholic communion; the nuns of the monastery "Sacerdos" refused to obey and were distributed among orthodox communities; later on however they were united to the Catholic church; the nuns of Abbess Joannias accepted the faith with joy. To them all (men and women) he returned their monasteries (465C-508C). There follows a long exposition of the right faith in view of the Severian doctrine.

In conclusion he assures John that he writes so on the faith, not as ignorant of his, John's, fidelity to it, but wrought up at the possibility of heretical councils prevailing at CP.

1. The date of Theodore's arrival in Africa is given, November 641. Pyrrhus had resigned the patriarchate 29-9-641; Martina and her sons were disgraced in October; Constans II held sole power from 9-11-641. Of these events there is no indication that Maximus had any knowledge. Grumel (EO 26 [1927] 29) supposes that Maximus knew of Martina's fall, because he refers to her only as "Godprotected Patrician" (460B1, 461B10) and not as "Basilissa". Heraclius, it is true, wished her to be honored as empress, but at the reading of his testament the people of CP made it clear that they would have no woman basileus. Let Constantine and Heracleonas be the basileis, for her the honor of being the mother of emperors (Nicephorus - *Breviarium* p. 31 - PG 100, 921C). Grumel's supposition therefore is to be rejected.
2. Another chronological reference is that to Martina's departed husband, Heraclius (461A10). A second reference to Heraclius is that of 464C13, of George's referring the question of the heretics to the emperor. This will be clarified from the following note.
3. The structure of the narrative portion of this epistle is to be noted. First is given the events ensuant on Theodore's arrival; then because there is still doubt in Maximus' mind and the question is the serious one of aiding heresy, of which John may be guilty, he comes to review George's relations with the refugee Monophysites (464B5ff). The circumstances thus related must have occurred over the course of several years, perhaps from the Arab conquests of Syria (634-6); correspondingly the appeal to the emperor must have been made while Heraclius was still alive, and therefore to him rather than to his son Constantine, coemperor. Nor is such an order improbable as coming from Heraclius. Here there is no question of Monothelitism, but Severian Monophysitism pure and simple. Now the *Ecthesis* of 638 anathematized Severus.
4. The effects of Theodore's letter should be more distinctly noted. The faithful are gravely perturbed, not only by the implication that Martina is Monophysite, but even more so it would seem by the active propaganda and boasting of the Monophysites, come to life again. For according to the second part, (465AB) George had succeeded in bringing all to the one Church. Perhaps the relapse of the community to which ep 18 is addressed is a result of this Monophysite revival.
5. It must be clearly realized that the imperial doctrine, not yet condemned (Monothelitism, Monenergism, the *Ecthesis*) does not enter into consideration but only Severian Monophysitism. This explains the purely anti-monophysite character of the doctrinal portion of the letter.
6. This will likewise explain the seriousness of John's cooperation in this letter. But further, is not John, if Maximus can hold him responsible, minister, eunuch, of the imperial *Gynaeceion?* He therefore would drop out of court life with Martina's fall.
7. This provides further indication that, to Maximus' knowledge, Martina

was still in power; for not only is this epistle but two subsequent ones (44, 45) are addressed to him to procure George's return.

8. A final comment must be made. Theodore brought no other dispatch whatsoever. Maximus notes this (460B10) in a general way and immediately manifests his perplexity that John had not informed him of the affair by the same messenger. This, and the implied change of policy (to favor outright the Severians), is strong presumptive evidence that the letter was a forgery. No modern historian has made this supposition; it seems to me however the only hypothesis that will allow for all the strands of evidence. Nor have we the oaths and personality of Theodore before us to make us hesitate. Another subterfuge in the history of Melkite-Monophysite relations will surprise no one.

67 ep 18. Written in the name of George, the praiseworthy eparch of Africa, to nuns apostate from the Catholic Church at Alexandria. Dec. 641, Jan. 642 (584D-588B). George, through Maximus, briefly expounds the nature of the Catholic Communion and the doctrine of two natures. (588C)

He affirms that he had written many, even emperors, about them. He is therefore all the more surprised at their secession from the Church, at their return to their own vomit.

He therefore, in view of their persistence in heresy, orders them to give up to his agent Theopemptus the property he had given them. He will speak of them to the emperors and patriarchs on his proximate visit, ready to accept their decision in the nuns' regard.

However, should they return to the Catholic communion, he is ready and eager to restore to them his gifts and do all in his power on their behalf.

1. The title makes this community actually resident in Alexandria. The situation and the time is so similar to those of the communities mentioned in ep 12 (one of which was of Alexandrian origin) that it is most tempting to suppose a scribe's error.

2. As for the time, there is reference to the emperors (basileis) - the plural - 588C8, 589A6 *cf.* ep 44, 45 - 645C2, 649B7, ep B. Basileus was first assumed as official title in 629 when Heraclius and his son Constantine were so called (Bréhier, Fliche-Martin 5, 106[2]). But we have seen Maximus refer to the emperor in the singular (ep 12; item 66 § 2). This with reference to Heraclius. Here the situation most probably underlying the phrase is the effective regency of Martina (from May, death of Constantine 25-5-641 to October 641). There is also reference to the patriarchs. Now Cyrus was also in CP from 640 to summer 641. (In disgrace with Heraclius, reinstated by Martina and returned to Alexandria, entering there 14-9-641).

3. Note particularly the expectation of a proximate interview with the emperors and patriarchs (589A8). He has therefore already received orders to return, the reason for the recall is not divulged.

4. On the hypothesis made in note 1, the occasion of the relapse of this community, that of abbess Joannias, could well have been the agitation following upon the letter brought by Theodore.
5. The passage 584C-85B on faith and unity may be compared with the passage on the unitive power of faith in the *Mystagogia* (665CD) and with the rejoinder in the *acta* (RM 13 - 128C6): I love the Romans, as of the same faith, the Greeks as of the same tongue.

68 ep 16. To Cosmas the deacon. Early 642.

This note opens with a mention of George's trouble (576D). The news of Cosmas' steadfastness in the right faith (577A) is a source of encouragement. Maximus then proceeds to exhort to perseverance in present hardships.

This letter follows ep 14 after some lapse of time; see the final note to item 47.

69 sq ep 1. To the eparch George on sailing for CP. (so Vat. gr. 505, also Combefis 362) After ep 18, therefore early 642.

This letter is a long exhortation to constancy and fortitude by way of showing gratitude to the eparch (392AB). Above all Maximus and his confreres (those of ep 12 - 461A) desire that George be given back to them in health.
1. The theme and solemnity of this letter mark the importance of this voyage; all implies rather than explains the apprehension for George's safety and safe return.
2. Some borrowing of Stoic vocabulary (at least) is in evidence (365C4 *cf Amb* 10 - 1173A and Char 4, 49; *self-sufficient* for *bliss*).

70 ep 44. Letter of recommendation to John the Chamberlain. Winter 642.

(642D) After an introductory paragraph on the love of God manifest in the Incarnation and especially in the conversion of the straying, Maximus recommends to John's best care the noble Theocharistos, who has been to himself and to many others a source of great help in their exile. (645C)

He then recommends John to God's care; likewise the emperors (plural). For these latter especially he demands pardon for that they have taken from Africa its beloved, most charitable eparch, George. (648AB)

The scenes at his sailing (for CP) Maximus then describes, beseeching John to use all his influence for the return of this George.
1. This is a commendatory letter, that is a letter commending the bearer to the addressee. The bearer is not George (whom he does fervidly commend also to John) but Theocharistos. Combefis does not seem to have perceived this, for he prints his name (644D8) with a small letter. The encomium of Theocharistos is quite distinct from that of George, though both noblemen were alike benefactors of the exile monks. Nor is it possible that

in a letter of which George was the bearer there should occur a description of that same George's departure (648B). See the corroboration of this view in ep B.
2. There is no hint of the affair of ep 12. Why?

71 ep B. To Stephen, priest and superior (in Epifanovitch pp. 84ff). As ep 44, winter 642.

After a paragraph on his correspondent's proficiency in the ascetical life, Maximus comes to the point. He wants Stephen, his lord and teacher, when in CP to check this (document) with that given to Theocharistos or that sent to John the Chamberlain, lest some addition of the scribe be found changing its whole purport (*loc. cit.* 85 line 10ff.)
1. What is this document? See the following item, § 3.
2. Theocharistos is clearly a name, also, in ep 44.

72 ep 45. To John the Chamberlain. Early 642.

(648D) Maximus speaks of George straight off; then beginning once more (as in ep 44) to enumerate his virtues he breaks off with the remark that all this (649A) is contained in the former letter and another writing. Again the request to intercede for George with the emperors, urging them to give no heed to malicious tongues. The bearer is a young but prudent man.
1. Malicious tongues. This is the first hint at any cause for George's recall. Something similar is indicated at the beginning of ep 16, where Maximus declares himself grieved at the calumny which George suffers from those who fear not the Lord (576D). For that matter it seems the Africans were generally the butt of evil gossip at CP. So Victor of Carthage complains of the false accusations of which they may not even know (Mansi 10, 950B).
2. There are two possibilities of a cause for George's recall. One supposes, rather unthinkingly, that his rejection of the letter purporting to come from Martina is its cause. But this is impossible, for it requires news of George's rejection to reach CP and the return order of recall all before news reaches Africa of Martina's downfall, which occurred at CP a few weeks before Theodore's arrival in Africa. There is left the fact of malicious tongues. What their charges were there is no way of knowing. The affair of Theodore would only aggravate apprehension for George, if that.
3. There can scarcely be doubt that "the former letter" refers to ep 44; but what is this "other writing"? The reasons just given why George's rejection of Theodore's letter from Martina cannot be cause for recall are equally cogent here against supposing that "other writing" to be ep 12. However this "other writing" was a sufficiently important document that it be sent in triplicate with precaution against falsification (ep B). This sup-

poses that Theocharistos, bearer of letter 44, was at the same time bearer to John and possessor of a copy of this "other writing."

The content of this "other writing" would probably have been a justification of George's administration, a partial sketch of which, it is true, is contained in ep 12 (467B5 - 465B).

It seems improbable that this would justify our identifying ep 12 as the "other writing." ep 12 is concerned wholly with (Martina's and) John's right faith (see especially the conclusion - 508D); ep 1, 44, 45 show concern only for George and his return.

73 TP 7 - 69. Dogmatic tome sent to Marinus deacon in Cyprus. c. 642.

Beginning with a customary ascetic-mystical introduction Maximus speaks of the fissiparous effects of heresy (72C-76), inveighs against the new *Ecthesis* (77A3) and begins against Monothelite positions, refuting the arguments drawn from Mt. 26:39 (*cf.* similar places cited at item 64) and Gregory of Nazianzen on conflicting wills (see item 48), and the famous theandric text of Denis. He could not have written before knowledge of the *Ecthesis* (640) nor before the debate became openly declared between Rome and CP. In the conclusion there is overt mention of two wills.

The date that suggests itself therefore is 640-2 with a preference for the latter year. In any case it follows TP **6**.

Maximus' technical term, *thelētikos,* occurs in both these opuscula (TP 6 - 68D; TP 7 - 77B; also in TP 1, 9, 15, 19, 27, 28; (*cf.* Pierres p. 14*ff).

74 TP 16 - 184. On the two wills of the One Christ our God. After 643?

This letter, save for the dispute with Pyrrhus, is the lengthiest treatise Maximus has left us dealing with the doctrine of two wills and energies. The very extent of the treatment prevents one assigning it a date when first the controversy became openly Monothelite. Some time therefore after 643 seems indicated.

However it seems strange that in the whole course of his treatment of will and energy Maximus does not once use the term *theletikos* or *energetikos*. These are used with great frequency in the dispute with Pyrrhus (TP 28, a. 645; TP 9, a. 646-48; TP 15, a. 646-47); and likewise in opuscula of uncertain (as TP 19 and 27) or probably earlier date (TP 6 and 7). How is this to be explained?

Vat. gr. 504 and 507 contain this TP 16 twice, once complete, as in Migne, and once excerpts (193D6-196A8, 209B13-C5) as from an epistle to Theodore the deacon.

75 TP 19 - 216. Two difficulties of the Byzantine deacon Theodore, rhetor and synodikarios of Paul archbishop of CP. 642 or after.

The texts of the difficulties are both first given followed by the answers of Maximus (answers 1-217, 2-224B). An initial date is given by the

title. Paul ascended the throne of CP October 1, 641. The term *thelētikos* occurs (221D - see item 77, TP 27). The replies are addressed to Marinus the priest. This doubtless is his Cypriote priest friend to whom he addresses several works, especially TP 1-3. One may suppose therefore that Marinus ran across Theodore's difficulties and forwarded them to Maximus for a full refutation.

76 TP 12 - 141. Excerpts from a letter to Peter the Illustrious. 643/4.

The excerptor (Anastasius the Librarian) was interested chiefly in Maximus' witness to the Roman See. Even in its present truncated form this letter is of great interest as a review of the chief events of the Monothelite controversy by one intimately familiar with the whole affair.

Peter had evidently asked Maximus how he should conduct himself with the expatriarch Pyrrhus, especially as to the use of the patriarchal address *most holy* (144A11). The letter must be dated not only after Pyrrhus' deposition (Sept. 29, 641) but after Pope John's death (Oct. 11, 642) as this pope is referred to as of holy memory (143A). There is further on an interesting correlation, as to this title, with letters of Pope Theodore (consecr. Nov. 24, 642) to Paul patriarch of CP (from Oct. 1, 641) and to his consecrators. In each letter the pope not only makes Pyrrhus responsible for the heresy but is distinctly surprised that he should still be termed by them *most holy* (Mansi 10, 704A & 707C).

Now as Paul's consecration preceded Theodore's by a year, it is just to suppose these letters among the first of the latter's pontificate. If further we accept the supposition that Sergius and the other bishops of Cyprus wrote to Theodore as a result of his letters, we arrive at a similar date — the turn of the year 642/3; for Sergius' letter is dated May 29, 643 (Mansi 10, 916E).

Maximus' letter shows his complete sympathy with the Roman attitude. It will date, however, somewhat later. Theodore had asked the emperor to have Pyrrhus sent to Rome that he may there be synodically judged (letter to Paul - Mansi 10, 705A). But Maximus speaks of Pyrrhus as judged (144A6) — though it may be elsewhere than at Rome. The date of this letter then must be well on in 643 or in 644. There can be no question that it was written before the dispute at Carthage (July 645).

As to the letter's content I would only note that the description of Sophronius' interview with Cyrus at Alexandria in June 633 (143C11ff) is not necessarily that of an eye-witness. The tone of the whole letter is excited; the gestures described (prostration) are common Byzantine ceremonial. Further, if my dating and interpretation of ep 13 be correct, Maximus could not have been an eye witness, as is generally supposed.

77 TP 27 - 280. Various definitions, of our holy and God-bearing fathers, on the two energies of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ. Between 640-6

The first text is attributed to Justin the Philosopher and, in the end, Martyr as from his: On Providence and Faith to Euphrasius the Sophist, whose incipit is: ἄχραντος ὁ λόγος. A second text is from the same work; a third of Alexander from his letter against the Arians to Aiglon bishop of Cynopolis. There follow texts of Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, S. Cyril, S. Basil, a second from Basil (against the Eunomians), again from Gregory of Nyssa, again from Cyril, from Ambrose's second book to Gratian and finally from S. Basil's syllogisms against Eunomius — in all 12 citations.

The first citation is of interest to us here, for it declares God to be essentially *energetikos* and *theletikos*. Now these, particularly the latter, became technical terms in the Christological debate, and apparently only in the fully Monothelite stage (see Pierres p. 14* ff). The appositeness of the text is so great that one almost suspects a trumped-up text — whether by Maximus or another is a different question. Three of the texts cited (Basil - 281D6; Greg. Nys. 284A5; Cyril - 284C) share *incipits* with those of the Lateran florilegium as cited by Pierres (12, 17, 22), who, however, does not include our present opusculum in his study of Maximus' florilegistic work.

I have not found Justin's text in Holl's edition of the antenicene witnesses of the *Sacra Parallela* (TU 20 (1899). Yet the very fact that the author makes capital of such a passage as this ascribed to Justin suggests a date between 640 and 646 (date of the tome to Stephen of Dora, TP 15).

78 TP 28 - 288. Dispute with Pyrrhus. July 645.

The descriptive title calls this work: " The report of the question raised over church dogmas." The dispute was held in the presence of the patrician Gregory and of many bishops and other notables between Pyrrhus one-time patriarch of CP and the very pious monk Maximus over the doctrine of one will introduced by Pyrrhus and his predecessor. The date is likewise given, July of the third indiction (645).

The scribe wrote in Rome where Pyrrhus had made his profession of the apostolic faith, before, however, this latter had reverted to his heresy (353AB). Peitz (*Hist. Jahrb.* 38 (1917) (429-33) identifies the Gregory in question here and in RM 2 (112C) with the George of ep 12, 1 and others. I can see no good reason for so doing.

The dispute has often been analysed or summarized as for example in Hefele-Leclercq III[1] 405-22.

79 TP 10 - 133. Copy of a letter sent to Sir Marinus, priest of Cyprus 645-46.

80-82 TP 1-3 - 9. To Marinus the very pious priest (see item 33 for a fuller title). 645-46.

83-85 TP3a, 3b, 3c - Epifanovitch 62f. 645-46

TP 10 is an excerpted letter, dealing with two theological questions (procession of the Spirit also from the Son and the sinlessness of Christ) objected against the then reigning pope, on the basis of his synodical letters (133D *fin*). In 136D7 there is mention of the *Ecthesis,* but not of the *Type;* furthermore this letter was written at Carthage (137B *ult*). Which pope? What synodicals? Apparently Pope Theodore. His synodicals are not known to be extant. Some have supposed the Lateran council to be in question; but this would force us to suppose Maximus' return to Africa after 649. The time of the debate with Pyrrhus, or the months before departure for Rome, seem most probable.

TP 1-3 are, according to von Balthasar (*Die Gn. Cent.* 153), not before the Roman stay. This seems more a way of saying "in the mature stage of the controversy", than a considered judgment that they wese written at Rome. In fact they may well have been written in Carthage. In TP 10 (137B) there is reference to the notebooks "on the soul and the other chapters" which admirably fit TP 1 with its considerations of the powers of the soul and TP 2, 3, 3abc, which appear to be further chapters of the same work, of which only these fragments have survived. Epistles 6 and 7 on the soul might be indicated if it were not for their early date and for the lack of anything connected with them to represent "and the other chapters".

Epifanovitch (p. 62ff.) prints three fragments with the following lemmata: of the same, of the properties of the two natures of Christ, chapter 58 (TP3a); of the same, from that on the wills and selfdeterminations of Christ, chapter 59 (TP3b); of the same, from the 92 chapter (TP3c). In his introduction he identifies these three pieces as found in St John Damascene's *De fide orthodoxa* 3. 13, 14, 18 or, in the Greek numeration, 57, 58, 62 (PG 94, 1033A3-14; 1033B (beginning of chapter) - 1036A5; 1076D2 -1077A1); and supposes that they are the Damascene's elaboration on a Maximian base. He refers to TP 9 - 117 B, to TP 25 - 273CD, to TP28 - 348C and especially to TP 28 - 289B13-C8 which is found *verbatim in De fide orthodoxa* 3. 14 - 1033D3-1036A5. However the chapter numbers are not identical; nor is it impossible that John Damascene took over entire chapters from Maximus. Maximus is quite capable of cribbing from his own works; the Damascene is known to have cribbed on a large scale, copying the greater part of Pseudo-Cyril's *De sacrosancta Trinitate* into the *De fide orthodoxa* (see J. de Guibert, *Rech. de science rel.* 3 (1912) 356-68). The authorship of these three pieces can therefore be finally determined only by a careful study of the relations of Maximus and the Damascene. A *prima facie* supposition, however, would seem to favor Maximus.

Supposing therefore these 6 pieces to form part of a greater whole, the date of the group will be 645-46, written before TP 10 and therefore before Maximus departure (with Pyrrhus?) from Africa for Rome sometime in the latter half of 645 or early 646. This is in fact the date given by Wagenman (*Realencycl. für Theol. und Kirche* 12, 464 line 48).

As to the contents, two notes are in order: some have doubted the authenticity of TP 10 because of its doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost. See Combefis' note on this - 139-40.

The introduction to TP 1, " The subtlest and most scholastic product of Maximus' pen " (Von Balthasar *Die Gn. Cent.* 153) is a very concise compendium of the spiritual life, showing many connections with the early ascetical work. Maximus, at least, was not aware of compiler's incoherence in his early and later thought.

86 TP 9 - 112. To the Christ-loving Fathers, superiors, monks, dwelling here in Sicily and to the orthodox people. 646-8.

Maximus is here concerned to defend his good name for orthodoxy, lest the people be scandalized. He had already defended himself before them orally and now sets out to write his apology (113 AB).

The chief accusation was that Maximus asserted three wills and energies, that is, one for each nature and one for the union. This is refuted (113B - 121A). Then he turns to two passages of Cyril (121B, 125C), which gave occasion to the same charge.

Finally he is incriminated for two of his letters; the one, to Marinus propounding three wills, he declares never to have written (129A); the other to Pyrrhus (ep 19) he admits to have written and, though the excessive praise there bestowed on Pyrrhus (he does not here mention Sergius who also received signal praise in the same letter) then seemed justified, he now regrets it, the doctrine however is quite orthodox (129Cff).

From the inscription and opening paragraph it appears that Maximus wrote in Sicily, after having been in contact with the monastic communities. The reference to Pyrrhus' " complete deviation" (132C9) places the letter necessarily after the latter's relapse to imperial orthodoxy. Note the fully developed dyothelite terminology (especially *theletikos*, *energetikos* -128C, *cf.* Pierres p. 15*ff.).

The letter dates then from 646 or after; and doubtless before the Lateran council as he refers to five oecumenical synods (128B7) while elsewhere (TP 11 - 137D) he mentions six, the last being the Lateran of 649, as it would seem.

87 TP 15 - 153. Spiritual and dogmatic tome... addressed to Stephen the most holy bishop of Dora... 646-7.

The title of the work declares it to be against the *Ecthesis*, showing the same to be contrary to the fathers, consonant with the heretics' writings. Attention was drawn to this florilegium by E. Caspar *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.* 31 (1932) 75-137); it has subsequently been the subject of a doctoral dissertation by Pierres. Pierres gives the date 646-7; Wagenman (*Realencycl. für Theol. und Kirche* 12, 464[52]) is less precise (645-8). This is the most extensive florilegium due to Maximus. There are however others among his writings (see TP 27, 26, 23).

88 TP 11-137. From the letter written at Rome. 649

This short excerpt is a warm praise of the Roman Church and her doctrinal authority. It seems written shortly after the Lateran council. The general tone suggests this as also the reference (137D7) to six holy synods (the five oecumenical plus the Lateran). This is already Combefis' suggestion (141-2), accepted by Grumel.

89 RM. May 655.
90 ep C. May 655.
91 DB Sept. 656.

Documents of the trial of Maximus.

Since the studies of Devreesse on these documents (see the bibliography) it is useless to treat of them here. The six documents are listed in the first article (AB 46 (1928) 8f).

Yet the *Relatio Motionis* of May 655 with the letter to Anastasius of the same time (109-29; 132f) and the *Dispute* at Bizya of August - September 656 (136-72) must be mentioned here as indispensable sources for Maximus' mature thought and for his ascendancy over his fellow men.

For those who cannot lay hands on the volumes of the *Analecta Bollandiana* I shall only note the following:

In the RM the passage of § 15 ὃ οὐκ ἔχει... ἐπίσκεψιν (129A10-14) is vagrant (AB 46 (1928) 41[1]); in DB, cap 32 (169B) is an added note, lacking in many mss (*ibid.* 38[1]); cap. 33 is a fragment of a Monothelite council of 662, found also in Mansi 11, 74 (*ibid.* 39).

INDICES

Note: a cross + *before* the serial number means an item surely dated to within a few months;
the sign § *after* the serial number means a conjectural dating;
the sign §§ *after* the serial number means complete uncertainty (items 1-4);
sq indicates appertenance to a series.

INDEX I

List of Maximus' works as they appear in Migne,
with date and serial number in date - list.

Relatio Motionis (RM)	PG 90,	109-29	655, May	+89
Ad Anastasium monachum (ep C)		132f	655, May	+90
Disputatio Bizyae (DB)		136-72	656, Aug.-Sept.	+91
Quæstiones ad Thalassium (Thal)		244-785	630-33	36sq
Quæstiones et Dubia (QD)		785-856	by 626	13§
Expositio in psalmum 59 (Ps 59)		856-72	by 626	12
Orationis Dominicae expositio (PN)		872-910	628-30	25
Liber asceticus (LA)		912-56	by 626	10
Capita de charitate (Char)		960-1080	by 626	11
Cap. Theologica et Oeconomica (ThOec)		1084-1173	630-34	37
Capita 15 (Cap ie')		1177A-85A5	630-34	37a§
Quaestiones ad Theopemptum (Theop)		1393-1400	630-33	41§
Opuscula Theologica et Polemica (TP)				
1	PG 91,	9-39	645-46	80
2		40-45	645-46	81
3		45-56	645-46	82
4		56-61	634-40	48
5		64-65	by 633	40
6		65-69	640-42	64
7		69-89	c. 642	73
8		89-112	c. 640	61
9		112-132	646-48	86
10		133-37	645-46	79
11		137-40	649	88
12		141-46	643-44	+76
13		145-49	626-7	15§
14		149-53	by 640	50
15		153-84	646-47	87
16		184-212	after 643	74
17		212	by 626	14§
18		213-16	626-33	22
19		216-28	642 or after	75
20		228-45	by 640	49
21		245-57	633? or 646?	39
22		257-60	uncertain	4§§

23	260-68	626-33	23
24	268	c. 640	62
25	269-73	c. 640	63
26	276-80	640	65§
27	280-85	640-46	77
28 Dispute with Pyrrhus	288-353	645, July	+78

Epistolae (ep)

1	PG 91, 363-392	early 642	+69sq
2	392-408	by 626	6
3	408-412	by 626	7
4	413-420	by 626	8
5	420-424	uncertain	1§§
6	424-432	before 624/25	5§
7	433-440	628 or 643	+24
8	440-445	632	19sq
9	445-449	628-30	31§
10	449-453	by 626 or 630-34?	9
11	453-457	African stay	59§
12	460-509	641, Nov.-Dec.	+66sq
13	509-533	633-34	44
14	533-544	634-40	47
15	544-576	after 634, 634-40	46
16	576-580	early 642	+68
17	580-584	by 633	38
18	584-589	641, Dec.-642, Jan.	+67
19	589-597	633 end-634 begin.	42
20	597-604	628-30	33§
21	604-605	627-33?	21
22	605	indeterminable	2§§
23	605-608	628/29?	30
24	608-613	628/29	28
25	613	633 or after	45
26	616-617	628	32§
27	617-620	628/29	29
28	620-621	626-32	16sq
29	621-624	626-32	18sq
30	624	626-32	17sq
31	624-625	626-32	20sq
32-35	625-629	uncertain	51§-54§
36-39	629-633	uncertain	55§-58§
40	633-636	630-34	34sq
41	636	630-34	35sq
42	636-637	uncertain	3§§
43	637-641	628/29	28
44	641-648	642 winter	+70sq
45	648-649	642 early	+72sq

Mystagogia (Myst)	657-717	628-30	27
Ambiguorum liber (Amb)			
Amb I	1032-1060	634 or shortly after	43
Amb II	1061-1417	628-30	26
Computus Ecclesiasticus	PG 19, 1217-80	640-41	+65a
ep A Ex epistola s Maximi scripta ad abbatem Thalassium de iis quae apocrisiarii fecerunt Constantinopoli 638	Mansi 10, 677	640	60
ep B	Epifanovitch p 84f	642 winter	+71
TP 3a, 3b, 3c	Epifanovitch p 62ff, apparently chapters 58, 59, 92	645-46	83, 84, 85
Moscow Gnostic Century	Epifanovitch pp 33-56		0

INDEX II

Chronological list of Maximus' works.

0	Moscow Gn. Cent.	Dubious	23	TP 23	626-33
1§§	ep 5	uncertain			
2§§	ep 22	indeterm.	+24	ep 7	628 or 643
3§§	ep 42	uncertain	25	PN	628-30
4§§	TP 22	uncertain	26	Amb II	628-30
			27	Myst	628-30
5§	ep 6	before 624/25	28	ep 43/24	628/29
6	ep 2	by 626	29	ep 27	628/29
7	ep 3	by 626	30	ep 23	628/29
8	ep 4	by 626	31§	ep 9	628-30
9	ep 10	by 626 or 630-34	32§	ep 26	after 628
10	LA	by 626	33§	ep 20	628-30
11	Char	by 626	34sq	ep 40	630-34
12	Ps 59	by 626	35sq	ep 41	630-34
13§	QD	by 626	36sq	Thal	630-33
14§	TP 17	by 626	37	ThOec	630-34
15§	TP 13	626-7	37a	Cap ie'	630-34
16sq	ep 28	626-32	38	ep 17	by 633
17sq	ep 30	626-32	39	TP 21	633? or 646?
18sq	ep 29	626-32	40	TP 5	by 633
19sq	ep 8	632	41§	Theop	630-33
20sq	ep 31	632			
21	ep 21	627-33?	42	ep 19	633 end-634 begin.
22	TP 18	626-33	43	Amb I	634 or a little after

44	ep 13	633-34
45	ep 25	633 or after
46	ep 15	after 634, 634-40
47	ep 14	634-40
48	TP 4	634-40
49	TP 20	by 640
50	TP 14	by 640
51-54§	ep 32-35	uncertain
55-58§	ep 36-39	uncertain
59§	ep 11	African stay
60	ep A	640
61	TP 8	c. 640
62	TP 24	c. 640
63	TP 25	c. 640
64	TP 6	640-42
65§	TP 26	640
65a	Comp. eccl.	640-41
+66sq	ep 12	641, Nov.-Dec.
+67	ep 18	641-42, turn of
+68	ep 16	642 early
+69sq	ep 1	642 early
+70sq	ep 44	642 winter
+71	ep B	642 winter
+72sq	ep 45	642 early
73	TP 7	c. 642
74	TP 16	after 643
75	TP 19	642 or after
+76	TP 12	643-44
77	TP 27	640-46
+78	TP 28	645 July
79	TP 10	645-46
80	TP 1	645-46
81	TP 2	645-46
82	TP 3	645-46
83	TP 3a	645-46
84	TP 3b	645-46
85	TP 3c	645-46
86	TP 9	646-48
87	TP 15	646-47
88	TP 11	649
+89	RM	655 May
+90	ep C	655 May
+91	DB	656 Aug.-Sept.

INDEX III

Contemporary persons mentioned by name in the inscriptions or text of Maximus' writings and of the *acta*. Being at first a list of Maximus' correspondents only, it has not been possible to make the second element exhaustive.

Anastasius the apocrisarius:	TP 20-244C; *Hypomnesticon.*
Anastasius the monk:	ep C; RM 4, 5.
Arcadius, bishop in Cyprus:	in TP 12-143B8 *cf.* TP 20-245B *fin.* note 32.
Auxentius	ep 22
Conon, priest and superior	ep 25
Constantine, sacellarius	ep 5, 24 (*cf.* ep 43, to John)
Cosmas, deacon of Alexandria	ep 15, 16
Cydonia, bishop of (in Crete)	ep 21
Elpidius	LA, Char
Epiphanius patrician	RM 2, 5; DB 25
Eudocia, superioress	ep 31 (625B9)
George, priest and superior	TP 4, in ep 29, 31

George, prefect of Africa — ep 1, in ep 16, 18, 44, 45 (ep 17-584C?)
George Arsas, Paulianist — TP 28-333A
Gregory, prefect of Africa — TP 28 (288A, 353A); RM 2 - 112CI
Gregory the patrician — RM 2 - 112C
Gregory the son of Photinus — RM 4, 10
Honorius the pope — in TP 12,20 (from 237); TP 28 - (329C)
John IV pope — RM 11
John bishop of Alexandria — TP 28 - 333A
John bishop of Cyzicus — ep 6, 8?, 28-31; Amb II (1062f)
John the Chamberlain — ep 2, 3, 4, 10, 12, 27, 43 (*cf.* 24), 44, 45, in ep B
John, sacellarius of Peter strategos of Numidia (the Illustrious) — RM 1 - 112A
John the clerk (at Rome) — TP 20 - 244C; 28 - 328C-29A
Jordanes — ep 7 (ep 8?)
Julian, scholastic of Alexandria — ep 17
Marinus, priest of Cyprus — TP 1, 2, 3, 3a-c, 10, 19, 20, in TP 9 (129AB)
Marinus deacon in Cyprus — TP 7
Marinus the monk — ep 20
Menas, accuser of Maximus — RM 5, 12
Nicander, bishop — TP 8
Nuns of Alexandria — ep 18
Paul, patriarch of Constantinople — DB 4, 20
Paul, consul — DB 2, 24
Peter, patriarch of Constantinople — DB 2
Peter the Illustrious — ep 13, 14; TP 12; RM 1 - 112A, 113A; *Comput. eccles.* inscr.
Polychronius abbot — ep 32-39
Pyrrhus — ep 19; TP 28; in TP 9, 12; RM 11; DB 4, 12, 20
Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople — TP 28 - 332B; ep 19 - 592B; RM 6, 11; DB 4, 12, 20
Sergius Macaronas, bishop of Arsinoe — TP 28 - 332C
Sergius Magudas — RM 2 - 112C
Sergius Eukratas — RM 6, 11
Sicilians — TP 9
Sophronius — ep 8?; in TP 12, 28 (332f), ep 13 (533A)
Stephen bishop of Dora — TP 15
Stephen priest and superior — ep 23, B
Superioress — ep 11
Thalassius — Thal, ep 9, 26, 40-42, A
Theocharistos priest — RM 3 - 113C
Theocharistos the Illustrious — ep 44 (644D), B
Theodore the pope — RM 2, 14
Theodore bishop of Pharan — in TP 10 (136CD), 28 (332B)
Theodore priest in Mazaria (Sicily) — TP 21
Theodore the deacon — TP 16 (item 74)

Theodore the chancellor	in ep 12 - 460A12
Theodore the monk	TP 26
Theodore the Byzantine, synodikarios of Paul patriarch of Constantinople	TP 19
Theodore, son of John Candidatus, called Chila	RM 3
Theodosius bishop of Cesarea in Bithynia	DB
Theodosius consul	DB 2, 16
Theopemptos the scholastic	Theop
Theopemptos, agent of the prefect Geo.	in ep 18 (589A)
Thomas abbot	Amb I, in ep 40 (636A)
Thomas abbot	RM 2
Thomas Severian bishop	in ep 12 (461A)
Troilos patrician	RM 6, 11, 13, 14; DB 25